

S K E T C H E S
O F T H E
H I S T O R Y O F M A N.
V O L U M E I.

LETTERS

LETTERS

LETTERS

LETTERS

VOLUME I

Printed by W. C. ...
...
...

1. 1. 1.
13. 9. 1.
S K E T C H E S *K*

O F T H E

H I S T O R Y O F M A N.

I N T W O V O L U M E S.

V O L U M E I.

12 21

E D I N B U R G H :

Printed for W. CREECH, Edinburgh; and for
W. STRAHAN, and T. CADELL, London.

MDCCLXXIV.

1

SKETCHES

OF THE

HISTORY OF MAN.



VOLUME I

EDINBURGH

Printed by W. Green, Edinburgh, and for
W. Strahan and T. Cadell, London.

MDCCLXXIV

P R E F A C E.

THE following work is the substance of various speculations, that occasionally amused the author, and enlivened his leisure-hours. It is not intended for the learned; they are above it: nor for the vulgar; they are below it. It is intended for men, who, equally removed from the corruption of opulence, and from the depression of bodily labour, are bent on useful knowledge; who, even in the delirium of youth, feel the dawn of patriotism, and who in riper years enjoy its meridian warmth. To such men this work is dedicated; and that they may profit by it, is the author's ardent wish, and probably will be while any spirit remains in him to form a wish.

May not he hope, that this work, child of his gray hairs, will survive, and bear testimony for him to good men, that even a laborious calling, which left him not many leisure-hours, never banished from his mind, that he would little deserve to be of the human species, were he indifferent about his fellow-creatures:

Homo sum : humani nihil a me alienum puto.

Most of the subjects handled in the following sheets, admit but of probable reasoning; which is not a little slippery, as with respect to many reasonings of that kind, it is difficult to pronounce, what degree of conviction they ought to produce. It is easy to form plausible arguments; but to form such as will stand the test of time, is not always easy. I could amuse the reader with numerous examples of conjectural arguments, which, fair at a distant view, vanish like a cloud on a near approach. In the first sketch of this book, not to go farther, he will find recorded more than one example. The dread of being misled by such arguments, filled the author with anxiety; and after his utmost attention, he can but faintly hope, that he has not often wandered far from truth.

Above thirty years ago, he began to collect materials for a natural history of man; and in the vigour of youth, did not think the undertaking too bold, even for a single hand. He has discovered of late, that his utmost abilities are scarce sufficient for executing a few imperfect sketches.

Edinburgh, Feb. 23. 1774.

Most of the subjects handled in the following sheets, admit but of probable reasoning; which is not a little slippery, as with respect to many reasonings of that kind, it is difficult to pronounce, what degree of conviction they ought to produce. It is easy to form plausible arguments; but to form such as will

To the READER.

As one great object of the Editor is to make this a popular work, he has, chiefly with a view to the female sex, subjoined an English translation of all the quotations from other languages.

Above thirty years ago, he began to collect materials for a natural history of man; and in the vigour of youth, did not think the undertaking too bold, even for a single hand. He has discovered of late, that his utmost abilities are scarce sufficient for executing a few imperfect sketches.

Edinburgh, Feb. 23. 1774

C O N T E N T S.

V O L. I.

B O O K I.

Progreſs of Men as Individuals.

Sketch	Pag.
1. <i>Diverſity of men and of languages,</i>	1
2. <i>Progreſs of men with reſpect to food and population,</i>	44
3. <i>Progreſs of men with reſpect to property,</i>	61
4. <i>Origin and progreſs of commerce,</i>	68
5. <i>Origin and progreſs of arts,</i>	87
Sect.	
1. <i>Uſeful arts,</i>	87
2. <i>Progreſs of taſte and of the fine arts,</i>	106
6. <i>Progreſs of the female ſex,</i>	168
Appendix,	
<i>Concerning propagation of animals, and care of their off- spring,</i>	220
7. <i>Progreſs of manners,</i>	226
8. <i>Progreſs and effects of luxury,</i>	331

B O O K II.

Progreſs of Men in Society.

Sk.	Pag.
1. <i>Appetite for ſociety. — Origin of national ſocieties,</i>	355
2. <i>General</i>	

Sk.		Pag.
2.	<i>General view of government,</i>	390
3.	<i>Different forms of government compared,</i>	393
4.	<i>Progress of states from small to great, and from great to small,</i>	408
5.	<i>Great and small states compared,</i>	416
6.	<i>War and peace compared,</i>	426
7.	<i>Rise and fall of patriotism,</i>	439
8.	<i>Finances,</i>	455
	<i>Sect.</i>	
1.	<i>General considerations on taxes,</i>	456
2.	<i>Power of imposing taxes,</i>	460
3.	<i>Different sorts of taxes, with their advantages and disadvantages,</i>	465
4.	<i>Manner of levying taxes,</i>	471
5.	<i>Rules to be observed in taxing,</i>	474
6.	<i>Examination of British taxes,</i>	482
7.	<i>Regulations for advancing industry and commerce,</i>	488

V O L. II.

Sk.		Pag.
9.	<i>Military branch of government,</i>	1
10.	<i>Public police with respect to the poor,</i>	36
11.	<i>A great city considered in physical, moral, and political views,</i>	60
12.	<i>Origin and progress of American nations,</i>	70

C O N T E N T S.

xi

B O O K III.

Progress of Sciences.

Sk.		Pag.
	1. <i>Principles and progress of reason,</i>	102
	Sect.	
	1. <i>Principles of reason,</i>	ib.
	2. <i>Progress of reason,</i>	120
	Appendix,	165
	<i>A brief account of Aristotle's logic. With remarks,</i>	168
	Chap.	
	1. <i>Of the first three treatises,</i>	ib.
	2. <i>Remarks,</i>	175
	3. <i>Account of the First Analytics,</i>	193
	4. <i>Remarks,</i>	200
	5. <i>Account of the remaining books of the Organon,</i>	219
	6. <i>Reflections on the utility of logic, and the means of its improvement,</i>	229
	2. <i>Principles and progress of morality,</i>	242
	Part	
	1. <i>Principles of morality,</i>	ib.
	Sect.	
	1. <i>Human actions analysed,</i>	ib.
	2. <i>Division of human actions into right, wrong, and in-different,</i>	246
	3. <i>Laws of nature respecting our moral conduct in so-ciety,</i>	256
	4. <i>Principles of duty and of benevolence,</i>	267
	5. <i>Laws</i>	

Book 3. Sk. 2. Part 1. continued.

Sect.		Pag.
5.	<i>Laws respecting rewards and punishments,</i>	270
6.	<i>Laws respecting reparation,</i>	277
7.	<i>Final causes of the foregoing laws of nature,</i>	284
8.	<i>Liberty and necessity considered with respect to morality,</i>	293
Appendix,		
Upon chance and contingency,		308
Part		
2.	<i>Progress of morality,</i>	312
Sk.		
3.	<i>Principles and progress of theology,</i>	349
Chap.		
1.	<i>Existence of a Deity,</i>	ib.
2.	<i>Progress of opinions with respect to Deity,</i>	361
3.	<i>Religious worship,</i>	400
Sect.		
1.	<i>Religious worship,</i>	402
2.	<i>Morality considered as a branch of duty to our Maker,</i>	434

A P P E N D I X.

Sketches concerning Scotland.

Sk.		Pag.
1.	<i>Scotch entails considered in moral and political views,</i>	481
2.	<i>Government of royal boroughs in Scotland,</i>	491
3.	<i>Plan for improving and preserving in order the highways in Scotland,</i>	497

Pag.
270
277
284
293
308
312
349
ib.
361
400
402
434
Pag.
481
491
497

S K E T C H E S O F T H E H I S T O R Y O F M A N .

B O O K I .

Progress of MEN as INDIVIDUALS.

S K E T C H I .

DIVERSITY of MEN and of LANGUAGES.

WHETHER there be different races of men, or whether all men be of one race, without any difference but what proceeds from climate or other accident, is a profound question of natural history, which remains still undetermined after all that has been said upon it. As the question is of moment in tracing the history of man, I purpose to

VOL. I.

A

contribute

contribute my mite; and in order to admit all the light possible, a view of brute animals as divided into different races or kinds, will make a proper introduction.

As many animals contribute to our well-being, by labouring for us, or by affording us food and raiment, and as many are noxious; our terrestrial habitation would be little comfortable, had we no means but experience for distinguishing the one sort from the other. Were each individual animal a species by itself, (indulging the expression), differing from every other individual, a man would finish his days without acquiring so much knowledge of animals as is necessary even for self-preservation: experience would give him no aid with respect to any individual of which he has no experience. The Deity has left none of his works imperfect. Animals are formed of different kinds, each kind having a figure and a temper peculiar to itself. Great uniformity is discovered among animals of the same kind; no less variety among animals of different kinds: and to prevent confusion, kinds are distinguished externally by figure, air, manner, so clearly as not to escape even a child *. To complete this curious system, we have an innate sense, that each kind is endued with properties peculiar to itself; and that these properties belong to every individual of the kind (*a*). Our road to the knowledge of animals is thus wonderfully abridged: the experience we have of the disposition and properties of any animal, is applied without hesitation to every one of the kind. By that sense, a child, familiar with one dog, is fond of others that resemble it: an European, upon the

* "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field." *Gen. ii. 19.*

(*a*) See Elements of Criticism, edit. 4. vol. 2. p. 490.

first sight of a cow in Africa, strokes it as gentle and innocent; and an African avoids a tiger in Hindostan as at home.

If the foregoing theory be well founded, neither experience nor argument is required to prove, that a horse is not an ass, or that a monkey is not a man (a). Some animals indeed are so similar, as to render it uncertain whether they be not radically of the same species. But in every such instance there is little need to be solicitous; for I venture to affirm, that both will be found gentle or fierce, wholesome food or unwholesome. Such questions may be curious, but they are of no use.

The division of brute animals into different kinds, is not more useful to man than to the animals themselves. A beast of prey would be ill fitted for its station, if nature did not teach it what creatures to attack, and what to avoid. A rabbit is the prey of the ferret. Present a rabbit, even dead, to a young ferret that never had seen a rabbit; it throws itself upon the body, and bites it with fury. A hound has the same instinct with respect to a hare, and most dogs have it. Unless directed by nature, innocent animals would not know their enemy till they were in its clutches. A hare flies with precipitation from the first dog it ever saw; and a chicken, upon the first sight of a kite, cowers under its dam. Social animals, without scruple, connect with their own kind, and as readily avoid others *. Birds are not afraid of quadrupeds; not even of a cat, till they are taught by experience that a cat is their enemy. They appear to be as little afraid of a man naturally; and upon that account are far from being shy when left un-

* The populace about Smyrna have a cruel amusement. They lay the eggs of a hen in a stork's nest. Upon seeing the chickens, the male in amazement calls his neighbouring storks together; who, to revenge the affront put upon them, destroy the poor innocent female; while he bewails his misfortune in heavy lamentation.

(a) See M. Buffon's natural history.

molested. In the uninhabited island of Visia Grandé, one of the Philippines, Kempfer says, that birds may be taken with the hand. Hawks, in some of the South-sea islands, are equally tame. At Port Egmont in the Falkland Islands, geese, far from being shy, may be knocked down with a stick. The birds that inhabit certain rocks hanging over the sea in the island of Annabon, take food readily out of a man's hand. In Arabia Felix, foxes and apes show no fear of man; the inhabitants of hot countries having no notion of hunting. In the uninhabited island Bering, adjacent to Kamiskatka, the foxes are so little shy that they scarce go out of a man's way. Doth not this observation suggest a final cause? A partridge, a plover, a pheasant, would be lost to man for food, were they naturally as much afraid of him as of a hawk or a kite.

The division of animals into different kinds, serves another purpose, not less important than those mentioned; which is, to fit them for different climates. We learn from experience, that no animal nor vegetable is fitted for every climate; and from experience we also learn, that there is no animal nor vegetable but what is fitted for some climate, where it grows to perfection. Even in the torrid zone, plants of a cold country are found upon mountains where plants of a hot country will not grow; and the height of a mountain may be determined with tolerable precision from the plants it produces. Wheat is not an indigenous plant in Britain; no farmer is ignorant that foreign seed is requisite to preserve the plant in vigour. To prevent flax from degenerating in Scotland and Ireland, great quantities of foreign seed are annually imported. A camel is peculiarly fitted for the burning sands of Arabia; and Lapland would be uninhabitable but for rein-deer, an animal so entirely fitted for piercing cold, that it cannot subsist even in a temperate climate. Arabian and Barbary horses degenerate in Britain; and to preserve the breed in some degree of perfection, frequent supplies from their original climate are requisite. Spanish
horses

horses degenerate in Mexico, but improve in Chili; having more vigour and swiftness there than even the Andalusian race whose offspring they are. Our dunghill-fowl, imported originally from a warm country in Asia, are not hardened, even after many centuries, to bear the cold of this country like birds originally native: the hen lays few or no eggs in winter, unless in a house warmed with fire. The deserts of Zaara and Biledulgerid in Africa, may be properly termed the native country of lions: there they grow to nine feet long and five feet high. Lions in the south of Africa toward the Cape of Good Hope, grow but to five feet and a half long and to three and a half high. A breed of lions transplanted from the latter to the former, would rise to the full size; and sink to the smaller size, if transplanted from the former to the latter.

To preserve the different species of animals entire, as far as necessary, Providence is careful to prevent a mixed breed. Few animals of different species copulate together. Some may be brought to copulate, but without effect; and some produce a mongrel, a mule for example, which seldom procreates, if at all. In some few instances, where a mixture of species is harmless, procreation goes on without limitation. All the different species of the dog kind copulate together, and the mongrels produced generate others without end. But dogs are by their nature companions to men; and Providence probably has permitted a mixture, in order that every man may have a dog to his liking.

M. Buffon in his natural history borrows from Ray (a) a very artificial rule for ascertaining the different species of animals: "Any two animals that can procreate together, and whose issue can also procreate, are of the same species (b)." A horse and an

(a) Wisdom of God in the works of creation.

(b) Octavo editi vol. 8. p. 104. and in many other parts.

as can procreate together; but they are not, says he, of the same species, because their issue, a mule, cannot procreate. He applies that rule to the human race; holding all men to be of one race or species, because a man and a woman, however different in size, in shape, in complexion, can procreate together without end. And by the same rule he holds all dogs to be of one species. With respect to other animals, the rule should pass without opposition from me; but as it also respects man, the subject of the present inquiry, I propose to examine it with attention. Providence, it is true, hath prevented confusion; for in most instances it hath withheld from animals of different species a power of procreating together: but as our author has not attempted to prove that such restraint is universal without a single exception, his rule is evidently a *petitio principii*. Why may not two animals different in species produce a mixed breed? Buffon must say, that by a law of nature animals of different species never produce a mixed breed. But has he proved this to be a law of nature? On the contrary, he more than once mentions several exceptions. He admits the sheep and the goat to be of different species; and yet we have his authority for affirming, that a he-goat and a ewe produce a mixed breed which generate for ever (*b*). The camel and the dromedary, tho' nearly related, are however no less distinct than the horse and the ass. The dromedary is less than the camel, more slender, and remarkably more swift of foot: it has but one bunch on its back, the camel has two: the race is more numerous than that of the camel, and more widely spread. One would not desire distinguishing marks more satisfying; and yet these two species propagate together no less freely than the different races of men and of dogs. Buffon indeed, with respect to the camel and dromedary, endeavours to save his credit,

(a) Vol. 10. p. 138.

by a distinction without a difference. "They are," says he, "one species; but their races are different, and have been so past all memory (a)." Does this say more than that the camel and the dromedary are different species of the same genus? which also holds true of the different species of men and of dogs. If our author will permit me to carry back to the creation the camel and the dromedary as two distinct races, I desire no other concession. He admits no fewer than ten kinds of goats, visibly distinguishable, which also propagate together; but says that these are varieties only, tho' permanent and unchangeable. No difficulty is unmountable if words be allowed to pass without meaning. Nor does he even preserve any consistency in his opinions. Tho' in distinguishing a horse from an ass, he affirms the mule they generate to be barren, yet afterward, entirely forgetting his rule, he admits the direct contrary (b). At that rate a horse and an ass are of the same species. Did it never once enter into the mind of this author, that the human race would be strangely imperfect, if they were unable to distinguish a man from a monkey, or a hare from a hedge-hog, till it were known whether they can procreate together?

But it seems unnecessary after all to urge any argument against the foregoing rule, which M. Buffon himself inadvertently abandons as to all animals, men and dogs excepted. We are indebted to him for a remark, That not a single animal of the torrid zone is common to the old world and to the new. But how does he verify his remark? Does he ever think of trying whether such animals can procreate together? "They are," says he, "of different kinds, having no such resemblance as to make us pronounce them to be of the same kind. Linnæus and Brisson."

(a) Vol. 10. p. 1.

(b) Vol. 12. p. 223.

he adds, "have very improperly given the name of the camel to the lama and the pacos of Peru. So apparent is the difference, that other writers class these animals with sheep. Wool however is the only circumstance in which a pacos resembles a sheep: nor doth the lama resemble a camel except in length of neck." He distinguisheth in the same manner, the true Asiatic tiger from several American animals that bear the same name. He mentions its size, its force, its ferocity, the colour of its hair, the strips black and white that like rings surround alternately its trunk, and are continued to the end of its tail; "characters," says he, "that clearly distinguish the true tiger from all animals of prey in the new world; the largest of which scarce equals one of our mastives." And he reasons in the same manner upon the other animals of the torrid zone (a). Here then we have M. Buffon's authority against himself, that there are different races of men; for he cannot deny that certain tribes differ apparently from each other, not less than the lama and pacos from the camel or from the sheep, nor less than the true tiger from the American animals of that name. Which of his rules are we to follow? Must we apply different rules to different animals? and to what animals are we to apply the different rules? For proving that dogs were created of different kinds, what better evidence can be expected than that the kinds continue distinct to this day? Our author pretends to derive the mastiff, the bull-dog, the hound, the greyhound, the terrier, the water-dog, &c. all of them from the prick-ear shepherd's cur. Now, admitting the progeny of the original male and female cur to have suffered every possible alteration from climate, food, domestication; the result would be endless varieties, so as that no one individual should resemble another. Whence then are derived the different species

(a) See vol. 8. sec. Of animals common to the two continents.

of dogs above mentioned, or the different races or varieties, as M. Buffon is pleased to name them? Uniformity and permanency must be a law in their nature, for they never can be the production of chance. There are mongrels, it is true, among dogs, from want of choice, or from a depraved appetite: but as all animals prefer their own kind, mongrels are few compared with animals of a true breed. There are mongrels also among men: the several kinds however continue distinct; and probably will so continue for ever.

The celebrated Linnæus, instead of describing every animal according to its kind as Adam our first parent did, and Buffon, copying from him, has wandered wonderfully far from nature in classing animals. He distributes them into six classes, viz. *Mammalia*, *Aves*, *Amphibia*, *Pisces*, *Insecta*, *Vermes*. The *Mammalia* are distributed into seven orders, chiefly from their teeth, viz. *Primates*, *Bruta*, *Fera*, *Glires*, *Pecora*, *Bellue*, *Cete*. And the *Primates* are *Homo*, *Simia*, *Lemur*, *Vespertilio*. What may have been his purpose in classing animals so, I cannot guess, if it be not to enable us, from the nipples and teeth of any particular animal, to know where it lies in his book. It resembles the classing books in a library by size, or by binding, without regard to the contents. It may serve as a sort of dictionary; but to no other purpose so far as I can discover. How whimsical is it to class together animals that nature hath widely separated, a man for example and a bat? What will a plain man think of a method of classing that denies a whale to be a fish? Beside, one would wish to know why in classing animals he confines himself to the nipples and the teeth, when there are many other distinguishing marks. Animals are not less distinguishable by their tails; long tails, short tails, no tails: nor less distinguishable by their hands, some having four hands, some two, some none, &c. &c. At the

same time, if any solid instruction is to be acquired from such classing, I shall listen, not only with attention, but with satisfaction.

And now more particularly of man, after discussing other animals. If the only rule afforded by nature for classing animals can be depended on, there are different races of men as well as of dogs: a mastiff differs not more from a spaniel, than a white man from a negro, or a Laplander from a Dane. And if we have any faith in Providence, it ought to be so. Plants were created of different kinds to fit them for different climates, and so were brute animals. Certain it is, that all men are not fitted equally for every climate. There is scarce a climate but what is natural to some men, where they prosper and flourish; and there is not a climate but where some men degenerate. Doth not then analogy lead us to conclude, that as there are different climates on the face of this globe, so there are different races of men fitted for these different climates? The inhabitants of the frozen regions of the north, men, birds, beasts, fish, are all of them provided with a quantity of fat which guards them against cold. Even the trees are full of rosin. The Esquimaux inhabit a bitter cold country; and their blood and their breath are remarkably warm. The island St Thomas, under the line, is extremely foggy; and the natives are fitted for that sort of weather, by the rigidity of their fibres. The fog is dispelled in July and August by dry winds; which give vigour to Europeans, whose fibres are relaxed by the moisture of the atmosphere, as by a warm bath. The natives, on the contrary, who are not fitted for a dry air, have more diseases in July and August than during the other ten months. On the other hand, instances are without number of men degenerating in a climate to which they are not fitted by nature; and I know not of a single instance where in such a climate people have retained their original vigour. Several European colonies have subsisted in the torrid zone of America more than two centuries;

ruries; and yet even that length of time has not familiarised them to the climate: they cannot bear heat like the original inhabitants, nor like negroes transplanted from a country equally hot: they are far from equalling in vigour of mind or body the nations from which they sprung. The Spanish inhabitants of Carthagea in South America lose their vigour and colour in a few months. Their motion is languid; and their words are pronounced with a low voice, and with long and frequent intervals. Europeans who are born in Batavia soon degenerate. Scarce one of them has talents sufficient to bear a part in the administration. There is not an office of trust or figure but what is filled with native Europeans. Some Portuguese, who have been for ages settled on the sea-coast of Congo, retain scarce the appearance of men. South Carolina, especially about Charlestown, is extremely hot, having no sea-breeze to cool the air. Europeans there die so fast that they have not time to degenerate. Even in Jamaica, tho' more temperate by a regular succession of land and sea-breezes, recruits from Britain are necessary to keep up the numbers. The climate of the northern provinces resembles our own, and population goes on with great rapidity.

Thus it appears that there are different races of men fitted by nature for different climates. Upon a thorough examination another fact will perhaps also appear, that the natural productions of each climate make the most wholesome food for the people who are fitted to live in it. Between the tropics, the natives live chiefly on fruits, seeds, and roots; and it is the opinion of the most knowing naturalists, that such food is of all the most wholesome for the torrid zone, comprehending the hot plants, which grow there to perfection, and tend greatly to fortify the stomach. In a temperate climate, a mixture of animal and vegetable food is held to be the most wholesome; and there both animals and vegetables abound. In a cold climate, animals are in plenty, but

scarce any vegetables that can serve for food to man. What physicians pronounce upon that head, I know not; but if we dare venture a conjecture from analogy, animal food will be found the most wholesome for such as are made by nature to live in a cold climate.

M. Buffon, from the rule, That animals which can procreate together, and whose progeny can also procreate, are of one species, concludes, that all men are of one race or species; and endeavours to support that favourite opinion by ascribing to the climate, to food, or to other accidental causes, all the varieties that are found among men. But is he seriously of opinion, that any operation of climate, or of other accidental cause, can account for the copper colour and smooth chin universal among the Americans, the prominence of the *pudenda* universal among Hottentot women, or the black nipple no less universal among female Samoides? The thick fogs of the island St Thomas may relax the fibres of the natives, but cannot make them more rigid than they are naturally. Whence then the difference with respect to rigidity of fibres between them and Europeans, but from original nature? It is in vain to ascribe to the climate the low stature of the Esquimaux, the smallness of their feet, or the overgrown size of their head. It is equally in vain to ascribe to climate the low stature of the Laplanders *, or their ugly visage. Lapland is indeed piercingly cold; but so is Finland, and the northern parts of Norway, the inhabitants of which are tall, comely, and well proportioned. The black colour of negroes, thick lips, flat nose, crisped woolly hair, and rank smell, distinguish them from every other race of men. The Abissynians on the contrary are tall and well made,

* By late accounts it appears that the Laplanders are only degenerated Tartars; and that they and the Hungarians originally sprung from the same breed of men, and from the same country. Pere Hel, the Jesuit, an Hungarian, made lately this discovery, when sent to Lapland for making some astronomical observations.

their

their complexion a brown olive, features well proportioned, eyes large and of a sparkling black, thin lips, a nose rather high than flat. There is no such difference of climate between Abyssinia and Negroland as to produce these striking differences. At any rate, there must be a considerable mixture both of soil and climate in these extensive regions; and yet not the least mixture is perceived in the people.

If the climate have any commanding influence, it must be chiefly displayed upon the complexion; and in that article accordingly our author exults. "Man," says he, "white in Europe, black in Africa, yellow in Asia, and red in America, is still the same animal, tinged only with the colour of the climate. Where the heat is excessive, as in Guinea and Senegal, the people are perfectly black; where less excessive, as in Abyssinia, the people are less black; where it is more temperate, as in Barbary and in Arabia, they are brown; and where mild, as in Europe and Lesser Asia, they are fair (a)." But here he triumphs without a victory: he is forced to acknowledge, that the Samoides, Laplanders, and Greenlanders, are of a fallow complexion; for which he has the following salvo, that the extremities of heat and of cold produce nearly the same effects on the skin. But he is totally silent upon a fact that singly overturns his whole system of colour, viz. that all Americans without exception are of a copper colour, tho' in that vast continent there is every variety of climate. Neither doth the black colour of some Africans, nor the brown colour of others, correspond to the climate. The people of the desert of Zaara, commonly termed Lower Ethiopia, tho' exposed to the vertical rays of the sun in a burning sand yielding not even to Guinea in heat, are of a tawny colour, far from being jet black like negroes. The natives of Monomotapa are perfectly black, with crisped woolly hair, tho' the southern parts of that extensive kingdom are in a

(a) Book 5.

temperate

temperate climate, very different from that of Guinea. And the Caffres, even those who live near the Cape of Good Hope, are the same sort of people. The heat of Abyssinia approacheth nearer to that of Guinea; and yet, as mentioned above, the inhabitants are not black. Nor shall our author's ingenious observation concerning the extremities of heat and cold purchase him impunity with respect to the fallow complexion of the Samoides, Laplanders, and Greenlanders. The Finlanders and northern Norwegians live in a climate not less cold than that of the people mentioned; and yet are fair beyond other Europeans. I say more, there are many instances of races of people preserving their original colour in climates very different from their own; but not a single instance of the contrary so far as I can learn. There have been four complete generations of negroes in Pennsylvania without any visible change of colour: they continue jet black as originally. Shaw, in his travels through Barbary, mentions a people inhabiting the mountains of Aurefs bordering upon Algiers on the south, who appeared to be of a different race from the Moors. Their complexion, far from swarthy, is fair and ruddy; and their hair a deep yellow, instead of being dark as among the neighbouring Moors. He conjectures them to be a remnant of the Vandals, perhaps the tribe mentioned by Procopius in his first book of the Vandalic war. If the European complexion be proof against a hot climate for a thousand years, I pronounce that it will never yield to climate. In the suburbs of Cochin, a town in Malabar, there is a colony of industrious Jews of the same complexion they have in Europe. They pretend that they were established there during the captivity of Babylon: it is unquestionable that they have been many ages in that country. Those who ascribe all to the sun, ought to consider how little probable it is, that the colour it impresses on the parents should be communicated to their infant children, who never saw the sun: I should be as soon induced to believe

lieve with a German naturalist, whose name has escaped me, that the negro colour is owing to an ancient custom in Africa of dying the skin black. Let a European for years expose himself to the sun in a hot climate, till he be quite brown, his children will nevertheless have the same complexion with those in Europe. The Hottentots are continually at work, and have been for ages, to darken their complexion; but that operation has no effect on their children. From the action of the sun is it possible to explain, why a negro, like a European, is born with a ruddy skin, which turns jet black the eighth or ninth day?

Different tribes are distinguishable, not less by internal disposition than by external figure. Nations are for the most part so blended by war, by commerce, or by other means, that vain would be the attempt to trace out an original character in any cultivated nation. But there are savage tribes, which, so far as can be discovered, continue to this day pure without mixture, who act by instinct not art, who have not learned to disguise their passions: to such I confine the inquiry. There is no propensity in human nature more general than aversion to strangers, as will be made evident in a following sketch (a). And yet some nations must be excepted, not indeed many in number, who are remarkably kind to strangers; by which circumstance they appear to be of a peculiar race. In order to set the exceptions in a clear light, a few instances shall be premised of the general propensity. The nations that may be the most relied on for an original character, are islanders at a distance from the continent and from each other. Among such, great variety of character is found. Some islands adjacent to New Guinea, are inhabited by negroes, a bold, mischievous, untractable race; always ready to attack strangers when they approach the shore. The people of New Zealand are of a

(a) Book 2. sketch 1.

large size and of a hoarse voice. They appeared shy according to Tasman's account. Some of them however ventured on board in order to trade; but finding opportunity, they surprised seven of his men in a shallop, and without the slightest provocation killed three of them, the rest having escaped by swimming. The island called *Recreation*, 16th degree southern latitude and 148th of longitude west from London, was discovered in Roggewein's voyage. Upon sight of the ships, the natives flocked to the shore with long pikes. The crew made good their landing, having beat back the natives by a continued fire of muskets; who, returning after a short interval, accepted presents of beads, small looking-glasses, and other trinkets, without shewing the least fear: they even assisted the crew in gathering herbs for those who were afflicted with the scurvy. Some of the crew traversing the island in great security, and trusting to some of the natives who led the way, were carried into a deep valley surrounded with rocks; where they were instantly attacked on every side with large stones; and with difficulty made their escape, but not without leaving several dead upon the field. In Commodore Byron's voyage to the South sea, an island was discovered named *Disappointment*. The shore was filled with natives in arms to prevent landing. They were black, and without cloathing, except what covered the parts that nature teaches to hide. But a specimen is sufficient here, as the subject will be fully illustrated in the sketch referred to above.

The kindness of some tribes to strangers deserves more attention, being not a little singular. Gonneville, commander of a French ship in a voyage to the East Indies in the year 1503, was probably the first European who visited the *Terra Australis Incognita*; being driven thither by a tempest. He continued six months in that country, while his vessel was refitting; and the manners he describes were in all appearance original. The natives had not made a greater progress in the arts of life than the savage Canadians have

have done; ill clothed; and worse lodged, having no light in their cabins but what came in through a hole in the roof. They were divided into small tribes, governed each by a king; who, tho' neither better clothed nor lodged than others, had power of life and death over his subjects. They were a simple and peaceable people; and in a manner worshipped the French, providing them with necessaries, and in return thankfully receiving knives, hatchets, small looking-glasses, and other such baubles. In a part of California the men go naked; and are fond of feathers and shells. They are governed by a king, with great mildness; and of all savages are the most humane, even to strangers. An island discovered in the South sea by Tasman, 21st degree of southern latitude and 177th of longitude west from London, was called by him *Amsterdam*. The natives, who had no arms offensive nor defensive, treated the Dutch with great civility, except in being given to pilfering. At no great distance another island was discovered, named *Annamocha* by the natives, and *Rotterdam* by Tasman; possessed by a people resembling those last mentioned, particularly in having no arms. The Dutch, sailing round the island, saw abundance of cocoa-trees planted in rows, with many other fruit-bearing trees, kept in excellent order. Commodore Roggewein, commander of a Dutch fleet, discovered, an. 1721, a new island in the South sea; inhabited by a people lively, active, and swift of foot; of a sweet and modest deportment: but timorous and faint-hearted; for having on their knees presented some refreshments to the Dutch, they retired with precipitation. Numbers of idols cut in stone were set up along the coast, in the figure of men with large ears, and the head covered with a crown; the whole nicely proportioned and highly finished. They fled for refuge to these idols: and they could do no better; for they had no weapons either offensive or defensive. Neither was there any appearance of government or subordination; for they all spoke

and acted with equal freedom. This island, situated 28 degrees 30 minutes southern latitude, and about 115 degrees of longitude west from London, is by the Dutch called *Easter* or *Pasch Island*. The Commodore directing his course north-west, discovered in the southern latitude of 12 degrees, and in the longitude of 190, a cluster of other islands, planted with variety of fruit-trees, and bearing herbs, corn, and roots, in plenty. When the ships approached the shore, the inhabitants came in their canoes with fish, cocoa-nuts, Indian figs, and other refreshments; for which they received small looking-glasses, strings of beads, and other toys. These islands were well peopled: many thousands thronged to the shore to see the ships, the men being armed with bows and arrows, and appearing to be governed by a chieftain: they were of the same complexion with that of Europe, only a little more sunburnt. They were brisk and lively, treating one another with civility; and in their behaviour expressing nothing wild nor savage. Their bodies were not painted; but handsomely clothed, from the middle downward, with silk fringes in neat folds. Large hats screened their faces from the sun, and collars of odoriferous flowers surrounded their necks. The face of the country is charming, being finely diversified with hills and vallies. Some of the islands are ten miles in circumference, some fifteen, and some twenty. The historian adds, that these islanders are in all respects the most civilized and the best tempered people they discovered in the South sea. Far from being afraid, they treated the Dutch with great kindness; and expressed much regret at their departure. These islands got the name of *Bowman's islands*, from the captain of the *Tienhoven*, who discovered them. In Commodore Byron's voyage to the South sea, while they were passing through the streights of Magel-

The women were very loving, enticing the Dutchmen by every female art to the most intimate familiarity.

lan,

lan, some natives approached in their canoes; and upon invitation came on board, without fear, or even shyness. They at the same time appeared grossly stupid; and particularly could not comprehend the use of knives, offered to them in a present. In another part of the streights, the natives were highly delighted with the presents made them. Mr. Bougainville, in his voyage round the world, describes a people in the streights of Magellan, probably those last mentioned, as of a small stature, tame and peaceable, having scarce any cloathing in a climate bitterly cold. Commodore Byron discovered another island in the South sea covered with trees, which was named *Byron island*. The inhabitants were neither savage nor shy, trafficking freely with the crew, though they seemed addicted to thieving. One of them ventured into the ship. After leaving Otaheite, Mr Banks and Dr Solander, sailing westward, discovered a cluster of islands, termed by them *Society islands*: the natives were extremely civil, and appeared to have no aversion to strangers. The island of Oahena, north-west from that of Otaheite, is a delightful spot; the soil fertile, and the shores adorned with fruit-trees of various kinds. The inhabitants are well proportioned, with regular engaging features; the women uncommonly beautiful and delicate. The inhabitants behaved with great hospitality and probity to the people of the ship in which these gentlemen made a late voyage round the world.

To find the inhabitants of these remote islands differing so widely from the rest of the world as to have no aversion to strangers, but on the contrary showing great kindness to the first they probably ever saw, is a singular phenomenon. It is in vain here to talk of climate; because in all climates we find an aversion to strangers. From the instances given above, let us select two islands, or two clusters of islands, suppose for example Bowman's islands inhabited by Whites, and those adjacent to New Guinea inhabited by Blacks. Kindness to strangers is the national character

of the former, and hatred to strangers is the national character of the latter. Virtues and vices as entering into the character of individuals, depend on causes so various, and so variable, as to give an impression of chance more than of design. We are not always certain of uniformity in the conduct even of the same person; far less that sons will inherit their father's virtues or vices. In most countries, a savage who has no aversion to strangers, nor to neighbouring clans, would be noted as singular: to find the same quality in every one of his children, would be surprising: and would be still more so, were it diffused widely through a multitude of his descendants. Yet a family is as nothing compared with a whole nation; and when we find kindness to strangers a national character in certain tribes, we reject with disdain the notion of chance, and perceive intuitively that effects so regular and permanent must be owing to a constant and invariable cause. Such effects cannot be accidental, more than the uniformity of male and female births in all countries and at all times. They cannot be accounted for from education or example, which indeed may contribute to spread a certain fashion or certain manners, but cannot be their fundamental cause. Where the greater part of a nation is of one character, education and example may extend it over the whole; but the character of that greater part can have no foundation but nature. What resource then have we for explaining the opposite manners of the islanders above mentioned, but that they are of different races?

The same doctrine is strongly confirmed upon finding courage or cowardice to be a national character. Individuals differ widely as to these; but a national character of courage or cowardice must depend on a permanent and invariable cause. I therefore proceed to instances of national courage and cowardice, that the reader may judge for himself, whether he can discover any other cause for such steady uniformity but diversity of race.

The northern nations of Europe and Asia have at all times been remarkable

remarkable for courage. Lucan endeavours to account for the courage of the Scandinavians from a firm belief, universal among them, that they should be happy in another world.

Vobis auctoribus, umbræ,

Non tacitas Erebi sedes, Ditisque profundi

Pallida regna petunt; regit idem spiritus artus

Orbe alio: longæ (canitis si cognita) vitæ

Mors media est. Certe populi, quos despicit Arctos,

Felices errore suo; quos ille, timorum

Maximus, haud urget leti metus. Inde ruendi

In ferrum mens prona viris animæque capaces

*Mortis * (a).*

Pretty well for a poet! but among all nations the soul is believed to be immortal, tho' all nations have not the courage of the

* "If dying mortals dooms they sing aright,

"No ghosts descend to dwell in endless night;

"No parting souls to grisly Pluto go,

"Nor seek the dreary silent shades below;

"But forth they fly, immortal in their kind,

"And other bodies in new worlds they find.

"Thus life for ever runs its endless race,

"And, like a line, Death but divides the space;

"A stop which can but for a moment last,

"A point between the future and the past.

"Thrice happy they beneath the northern skies,

"Who that worst fear, the fear of death, despise;

"Hence they no cares for this frail being feel,

"But rush undaunted on the pointed steel;

"Provoke approaching fate, and bravely scorn

"To spare that life which must so soon return."

Rowe.

(a) Lib. i.

Scandi-

Scandinavians. The Caledonians were eminent for that virtue; and yet had no such opinion of happiness after death as to make them fond of dying. Souls after death were believed to have but a gloomy sort of existence, like what is described by Homer (b). Their courage therefore was a gift of nature, not of faith. The people of Malacca and of the neighbouring islands, who are all of the same race and speak the same language, are fierce, turbulent, and bold above any of the human species, tho' they inhabit the torrid zone, held commonly to be the land of cowardice. They never observe a treaty of peace when they have any temptation to break it; and are perpetually at war with their neighbours, or with one another. Instances there are, more than one, of twenty-five or thirty of them in a boat venturing, with no other weapons but poniards, to attack a European ship of war. These men inhabit a most fruitful country, which should naturally render them indolent and effeminate; a country abounding with variety of exquisite fruits and odoriferous flowers in endless succession; sufficient to sink any other people into voluptuousness. They are a remarkable exception from the observation of Herodotus, "That it is not given by the gods to any country, to produce rich crops and warlike men." This instance, with what are to follow, show past contradiction, that a hot climate is no enemy to courage. The inhabitants of New Zealand are of all men the most intrepid, and the least apt to be alarmed at danger. The Giagas are a fierce and bold people in the midst of the torrid zone of Africa: and so are the Ansieki, bordering on Loango. The wild Arabs, who live mostly within the torrid zone, are bold and resolute, holding war to be intended for them by Providence. The African negroes, tho' living in the hottest known country, are yet stout and vigorous, and the most healthy people in the universe, I need

(a) Odyſſey, b. 11.

(b) Iliad, b. 24.

scarce mention again the negroes adjacent to New Guinea, who have an uncommon degree of boldness and ferocity. But I mention with pleasure the island Otahelte, discovered in the South sea by Wallis, because the inhabitants are not exceeded by any other people in firmness of mind. The inhabitants are numerous; and tho' the Dolphin was probably the first ship they had ever seen, yet they resolutely marched to the shore, and attacked her with a shower of stones. Some volleys of small shot made them give way: but returning with redoubled ardour, they did not totally lose heart till the great guns thundered in their ears. Nor even then did they run away in terror; but advising together, they assumed looks of peace, and signified a willingness to forbear hostilities. Peace being settled, they were singularly kind to our people, supplying their wants, and mixing with them in friendly intercourse *. When Mr Banks and Dr Solander were on the coast of New Holland, the natives seeing some of our men fishing near the shore, singled out a number of their own equal to those in the boat, who marching down to the water-edge, challenged the strangers to fight them; an instance of the most heroic courage. The people in that part of New Holland must be a very different race from those whom Dampier saw.

A noted author (a) holds all savages to be bold, impetuous, and proud; assigning for a cause, their equality and independence. As in that observation he seems to lay no weight on climate, and as little on original disposition, it is with regret that my subject leads me in this public manner to differ from him with respect to the latter. The character he gives in general to all savages, is in

* It is remarkable that these people roast their meat with hot stones, as the Carledonians did in the days of Ossian.

(a) Mr Ferguson.

deed applicable to many savage tribes, our European forefathers in particular; but not to all. It but faintly suits even the North-American savages, whom our author seems to have had in his eye; for in war they carefully avoid open force, relying chiefly on stratagem and surprise. They value themselves, it is said, upon saving men; but as that motive was no less weighty in Europe, and indeed every where, the proneness of our forefathers to open violence, vouches for their superiority in active courage. The following incidents reported by Charlevoix give no favourable idea of some North-Americans with regard to that sort of courage. The fort de Vercheres in Canada, belonging to the French, was in the year 1690 attacked by some Iroquois. They approached silently, preparing to scale the palisade, when some musket-shot made them retire. Advancing a second time, they were again repulsed, wondering that they could discover none but a woman, who was seen every where. This was Madame de Vercheres, who appeared as resolute as if supported by a numerous garrison. The hopes of storming a place without men to defend it, occasioned reiterated attacks. After two days siege, they retired, fearing to be intercepted in their retreat. Two years after, a party of the same nation appeared before the fort so unexpectedly, that a girl of fourteen, daughter of the proprietor, had but time to shut the gate. With the young woman there was not a soul but one raw soldier. She showed herself with her assistant, sometimes in one place, sometimes in another; changing her dress frequently in order to give some appearance of a garrison, and always fired opportunely. The faint-hearted Iroquois decamped without success.

But if the Americans abound not with active courage, their passive courage is beyond conception. Every writer expatiates upon the torments they endure, not only patiently, but with singular fortitude; deriding their tormentors, and braving their utmost cruelty. North-American savages differ indeed so widely from those

those formerly in Europe, that it is difficult to conceive them to be of the same race. Passive courage they have even to a wonder; but abound not in active courage: our European forefathers, on the contrary, were much more remarkable for active courage than for passive. The Kamiskatkans in every article resemble the North-Americans. In war they are full of stratagem, but never attack openly if they can avoid it. When victorious, they murder without mercy, burn their prisoners alive, or tear out their bowels. If they be surrounded, and cannot escape, they turn desperate, cut the throats of their wives and children, and throw themselves into the midst of their enemies. And yet these people are abundantly free. Their want of active courage is the more surprising, because they make no difficulty of suicide when they fall into any distress. But their passive courage is equal to that of the Americans: when tortured in order to extort a confession, they show the utmost firmness; and seldom discover more than what they freely confess at their first examination.

The savages of Guiana are indolent, good-natured, submissive, and a little cowardly; tho' they yield not to the North-Americans as to equality and independence. The inhabitants of the Marion or Ladrone islands live in a state of perfect equality: every man avenges the injury done to himself; and even children are regardless of their parents. Yet these people are great cowards: in battle indeed they utter loud shouts; but it is more to animate themselves than to terrify the enemy. The negroes in the slave-coast of Guinea are good-natured and obliging; but not remarkable for courage. The Laplanders are of all the human species the most timid: upon the slightest surprise they fall down in a swoon like the feeblest female in England; thunder shakes them to pieces. The face of their country is nothing but rocks covered with moss; it would be scarce habitable but for rein-deer, on which the Laplanders chiefly depend for food.

The Macassars, inhabitants of the island Celebes in the torrid zone, differ from all other people. They have active courage above even the fiercest European savages; and they equal the North-American savages in passive courage. During the reign of Chaw Naraya King of Siam, a small party of Macassars, who were in the king's pay, having revolted, it required a whole army of Siamites to subdue them. Four Macassars, taken alive, were cruelly tortured. They were beat to mummy with cudgels, iron pins thrust under their nails, all their fingers broken, the flesh burnt off their arms, and their temples squeezed between boards; yet they bore all with unparalleled firmness. They even refused to be converted to Christianity, tho' the Jesuits upon that occasion offered to intercede for them. A tiger, let loose, having fastened on the foot of one of them, the man never once offered to draw it away. Another, without uttering a word, bore the tiger breaking the bones of his back. A third suffered the animal to lick the blood from his face, without shrinking, or turning away his eyes. During the whole of that horrid spectacle, they never once bewailed themselves, nor were heard to groan.

In concluding from the foregoing facts, that there are different races of men, I reckon upon strenuous opposition, not only from men biassed against what is new or uncommon, but from numberless sedate writers, who hold every distinguishing mark, internal as well as external, to be the effect of soil and climate. Against the former, patience is my only shield; but I cannot hope for any converts to a new opinion, without removing the arguments urged by the latter.

Among the endless number of writers who ascribe supreme efficacy to the climate, Vitruvius shall take the lead. The first chapter of his sixth book is entirely employed in describing the influence of climate on the constitution and temper of the natives.

The

The following is the substance, "For the sun, where he throws out a moderate degree of moisture, preserves the body in a temperate state; but where his rays are more fierce, he drains the body of moisture. In very cold regions, where the moisture is not suck'd up by the heat, the body, sucking in the dewy air, rises to a great size, and has a deep tone of voice. Northern nations accordingly, from cold and moisture, have large bodies, a white skin, red hair, gray eyes, and much blood. Nations, on the contrary, near the equator, are of small stature, tawny complexion, curled hair, black eyes, slender legs, and little blood. From want of blood they are cowardly: but they bear fevers well, their constitution being formed by heat. Northern nations, on the contrary, sink under a fever; but from the abundance of blood, they are bold in war." In another part of the chapter he adds, "From the thinness of the air, and enlivening heat, southern nations are quick in thought, and acute in reasoning. Those in the north, on the contrary, which breathe a thick and cold air, are dull and stupid." And this he illustrates from the case of serpents, which in summer-heat are active and vigorous; but in winter, become torpid and immoveable. He then proceeds as follows. "It is then not at all surprising, that heat should sharpen the understanding, and cold blunt it. Thus the southern nations are ready in counsel and acute in thought; but make no figure in war, their courage being exhausted by the heat of the sun. The inhabitants of cold climates, prone to war, rush on with vehemence without the least fear; but are slow of understanding." Then he proceeds to account, upon the same principle, for the superiority of the Romans in arms, and for the extent of their empire. "For as the planet Jupiter lies between the fervid heat of Mars and the bitter cold of Saturn; so Italy, in the middle of the temperate

“rate zone, possesses all that is favourable in either climate. Thus
 “by conduct in war she overcomes the impetuous force of northern
 “barbarians; and by vigour of arms confounds the politic
 “schemes of her southern neighbours. Divine providence appears
 “to have placed the Romans in that happy situation, in order
 “that they might become masters of the world.”—Vegetius
 “accounts for the different characters of men from the same
 “principle. *Omnēs nationes quæ vicinæ sunt soli, nimio calore
 “re siccatas, amplius quidem sapere, sed minus habere sanguinis
 “dicunt: ac propterea constantiam ac fiduciam cominus non
 “habere pugnandi, quia metuunt vulnera, qui se exiguum san-
 “guinem habere noverunt. Contra, septentrionales populi, remoti
 “a solis ardoribus, inconsultiores quidem, sed tamen largo san-
 “guine redundantes, sunt ad bella promptissimi * (a).”—Servius,
 “in his commentary on the *Æneid* of Virgil (b), says, “*Afri versipel-
 “les, Græci leves, Galli pigrioris ingenii, quod natura climatum
 “facit.*†”—Mallet, in the introduction to his history of Den-
 “mark, copying Vitruvius and Vegetius, strains hard to derive fe-
 “rocity and courage in the Scandinavians from the climate: “A
 “great abundance of blood, fibres strong and rigid, vigour inex-*

* “Nations near the sun, being exsiccated by excessive heat, are said to have a
 “greater acuteness of understanding but less blood: on which account, in fight-
 “ing they are deficient in firmness and resolution; and dread the being wounded,
 “as conscious of their want of blood. The northern people, on the contrary, re-
 “moved from the ardor of the sun, are less remarkable for the powers of the
 “mind; but abounding in blood, they are prone to war.”

† “The Africans are subtle and full of stratagem, the Greeks are fickle, the
 “Gauls slow of parts, all which diversities are occasioned by the climate.”

(a) Lib. 1. cap. 2. *De re militari*.

(b) Lib. 6. ver. 724.

“haustible,

"haughty, formed the temperament of the Germans, the Scan-
 "dinavians, and of all other people who live under the same cli-
 "mate. Robust by the climate, and hardened with exercise, con-
 "fidence in bodily strength formed their character. A man who
 "relies on his own force, cannot bear restraint, nor submission to
 "the arbitrary will of another. As he has no occasion for arti-
 "fice, he is altogether a stranger to fraud or dissimulation. As
 "he is always ready to repel force by force, he is not suspicious
 "nor distrustful. His courage prompts him to be faithful in
 "friendship, generous, and even magnanimous. He is averse
 "to occupations that require more assiduity than action; because
 "moderate exercise affords not to his blood and fibres that degree
 "of agitation which suits them. Hence his disgust at arts and
 "manufactures, and as passion labours to justify itself, hence his
 "opinion, that war only and hunting are honourable professions."

Before subscribing to this doctrine, I wish to be satisfied of a few
 particulars. Is our author certain, that inhabitants of cold coun-
 tries have the greatest quantity of blood? And is he certain, that
 courage is in every man proportioned to the quantity of his
 blood *? Is he also certain, that ferocity and love of war did uni-
 versally obtain among the northern Europeans? Tacitus reports

* At that rate, the loss of an ounce of blood may turn the balance. Courage
 makes an essential ingredient in magnanimity and heroism: are such elevated vir-
 tues corporeal merely? is the mind admitted for no share? This indeed would be
 a mortifying circumstance in the human race. But even supposing courage to be
 corporeal merely, it is however far from being proportioned to the quantity of
 blood: a greater quantity than can be circulated freely and easily by the force of
 the heart and arteries, becomes a disease, termed a *plethora*. Bodily courage is
 chiefly founded on the solids. When by the vigour and elasticity of the heart and
 arteries a brisk circulation of blood is produced, a man is in good spirits, lively and
 bold; a greater quantity of blood, instead of raising courage to a higher pitch, ne-
 ver fails to produce sluggishness, and depression of mind.

a very different character of the Chauci, who inhabited the north of Germany: "Tam immensum terrarum spatium non tenent tantum Chauci, sed et implent: populus inter Germanos nobilissimus, quique magnitudinem suam malit justitia tueri. Sine cupiditate, sine impotentia, quieti, secretique, nulla provocant bella, nullis raptibus aut latrociniis populantur. Idque præcipuum virtutis ac virium argumentum est, quod ut superiores agunt, non per injurias assequuntur. Prompta tamen omnibus arma, ac, si res poscat, exercitus * (a)." Again, with respect to the Aarii, he bears witness, that beside ferocity and strength of body, they were full of fraud and artifice. Neither do the Laplanders nor Samoides correspond to his description, being remarkable for pusillanimity, tho' inhabitants of a bitter cold country †. Lastly, a cold climate doth not always make the inhabitants averse to occupations that require more assiduity than action: the people of Iceland formerly were much addicted to study and literature; and for many centuries were the chief historians of the north. They are to this day fond of chess, and spend much of their time

* "So immense an extent of country is not possessed only, but filled by the Chauci; a race of people the noblest among the Germans, and who chuse to maintain their grandeur by justice rather than by violence. Confident of their strength, without the thirst of increasing their possessions, they live in quietness and security: they kindle no wars; they are strangers to plunder and to rapine; and what is the chief evidence both of their power and of their virtue; without oppressing any, they have attained a superiority over all. Yet when occasion requires, they are prompt to take the field; and their troops are speedily raised."

† Scheffer, in his history of Lapland, differs widely from the authors mentioned; for he ascribes the pusillanimity of the Laplanders to the coldness of their climate.

(a) De moribus Germanorum, cap. 35.

in that amusement: there is scarce a peasant but who has a chess-board and men. Mr Banks and Dr Solander report, that the peasants of Iceland are addicted to history, not only of their own country, but of that of Europe.

The most formidable antagonist remains still on hand, viz. Montesquieu, who is a great champion for the climate; observing, that in hot climates people are timid like old men, and in cold climates bold like young men. This in effect is to maintain, that the torrid zone is an unfit habitation for men; that they degenerate in it, lose their natural vigour, and even in youth become like old men. That justly celebrated author certainly intended not any imputation on Providence; and yet, doth it not look like an imputation, to maintain, that so large a portion of the globe is fit for beasts only, not for men? He ought to have explained why a certain race of men may not be fitted for a hot climate, as others are for a temperate, or for a cold one. There does not appear any opposition between heat and courage, more than between cold and courage: on the contrary, courage seems more connected with heat than with cold. The fiercest and boldest animals, a lion, for example, a tiger, a panther, thrive no where so much as in the hottest climates. The great condor of Peru in the torrid zone, is a bird not a little fierce and rapacious. A lion visibly degenerates in a temperate climate. The lions of Mount Atlas, which is sometimes crowned with snow, have not the boldness, nor the force, nor the ferocity of such as tread the burning sands of Zaara and Biledulgerid. Our author, it is true, endeavours to support his opinion by natural causes. These are ingenious and plausible; but unluckily they are contradicted by stubborn facts, which will appear upon a very slight survey of this globe. The Samoides and Laplanders are living instances of uncommon pusillanimity in the inhabitants of a cold climate; and instances, not few in number, have been mentioned of warlike people in a hot climate. To these

I add the Hindows, whom our author will not admit to have any degree of courage; tho' he acknowledges, that, prompted by religion, the men voluntarily submit to dreadful tortures, and that even women are ambitious to burn themselves alive with their deceased husbands. In vain does he endeavour to account for such extraordinary exertions of fortitude, active as well as passive, by the force of imagination; as if imagination could operate more forcibly in a woman to burn herself alive, than on a man to meet his enemy in battle. The Malaysans and Scandinavians live in very opposite climates, and yet are equally courageous. Providence has placed these nations each of them in its proper climate: cold would benumb a Malayan in Sweden, heat would enervate a Swede in Malacca; and both would be rendered cowards. I stop here; for to enter the lists against an antagonist of so great fame, gives me a feeling as if I were treading on forbidden ground.

The colour of the Negroes, as above observed, affords a strong presumption of their being a different race from the Whites; and I once thought, that the presumption was supported by inferiority in their understanding. But it appears to me doubtful, upon second thoughts, whether the inferiority of their understanding may not be occasioned by their condition. A man never ripens in judgement nor in prudence but by exercising these powers. At home the negroes have little occasion to exercise either of them: they live upon fruits and roots, which grow without culture: they need little cloathing: and they erect houses without trouble or art. Abroad, they are miserable slaves, having no encouragement either to think or to act. Who can say how far they might improve in a state of freedom, were they obliged, like Europeans, to procure bread with the sweat of their brows? Some kingdoms in Negroland, particularly that of Whidah, have made great improvements in government, in police, and in manners. The negroes, particularly on the gold-coast, are naturally gay: they are industrious,

industrious, apprehend readily what is said to them, have a good judgement, are equitable in their dealings, and accommodate themselves readily to the manners of strangers.

I shall close the survey with some instances that seem to differ widely from the common nature of man. The Giagas, a fierce and wandering nation in the heart of Africa, are in effect land-pirates, at war with all the world. They indulge in polygamy; but bury all their children the moment of birth, and chuse in their stead the most promising children taken in war. There is no principle among animals more prevalent than affection to their offspring: supposing the Giagas to be born without hands or without feet, would they be more distinguishable from the rest of mankind *? The author of an account of Guiana, mentioning a deadly poison composed by the natives, says, "I do not find that even in their wars they ever use poisoned arrows. And yet it may be wondered, that a people living under no laws, acted with no religious principle, and unrestrained by the fear of present or future punishment, should not sometimes employ that fatal poison for gratifying hatred, jealousy, or revenge. But in a state of nature, though there are few restraints, there are also fewer temptations to vice; and the different tribes are

* I have oftener than once doubted whether the authors deserve credit from whom this account is taken; and, after all, I do not press it upon my readers. There is only one consideration that can bring it within the verge of probability, viz. the little affection that male savages have for their new-born children, which appears from the ancient practice of exposing them. The affection of the mother commences with the birth of the child; and had she a vote, no infant would ever be destroyed. But as the affection of the father begins much later, the practice of destroying new-born infants may be thought not altogether incredible in a wandering nation who live by rapine, and who can provide themselves with children more easily than by the tedious and precarious method of rearing them.

"doubtless sensible that poisoned arrows in war, would upon the whole do more mischief than good." This writer it would seem has forgot, that prospects of future good or evil never have influence upon savages. Is it his opinion, that fear of future mischief to themselves, would make the negroes of New Guinea abstain from employing poisoned arrows against their enemies? We have nothing but original disposition to account for manners so singular in the savages of Guiana. The Japanese resent injuries in a manner which has not a parallel in any other part of the world: it is indeed so singular as scarce to be consistent with human nature. Others wreak their resentment on the person who affronts them; but an inhabitant of Japan wreaks it on himself: he rips up his own belly. Kempfer reports the following instance. A gentleman coming down the great stair of the Emperor's palace, passed another going up, and their swords happened to clash. The person descending took offence: the other excused himself, saying that it was accidental; adding, that the swords only were concerned, and that his was as good as the other. I'll show you the difference, says the person who began the quarrel: he drew his sword, and ripped up his own belly. The other, piqued at being thus prevented in revenge, hastened up with a plate he had in his hand for the Emperor's table; and returning with equal speed, he in like manner ripped up his belly in sight of his antagonist, saying, "If I had not been serving my prince, you should not have got the start of me: but I shall die satisfied, having show'd you that my sword is as good as yours." The same author gives an instance of uncommon ferocity in the Japanese, blended with manners highly polished. In the midst of a large company at dinner, a young woman, straining to reach a plate, unwarily suffered wind to escape. Ashamed and confounded, she raised her breasts to her mouth, tore them with her teeth, and expired on the spot. The Japanese are equally singular in some of their religious

gious opinions. They never supplicate the gods in distress; holding, that as the gods enjoy uninterrupted bliss, such supplications would be offensive to them. Their holidays accordingly are dedicated to feasts, weddings, and all public and private rejoicings. It is delightful to the gods; say they, to see men happy. They are far from being singular in thinking that a benevolent deity is pleased to see men happy; but nothing can be more inconsistent with the common feelings of men, than to hold, that in distress it is wrong to supplicate the author of our nature for relief, and that he will be displeased with such supplication. In deep affliction, there is certainly no balm equal to that of pouring out the heart to a benevolent deity, and expressing entire resignation to his will.

In support of the foregoing doctrine, many particulars still more extraordinary might have been quoted from Greek and Roman writers; but truth has no occasion for artifice; and I would not take advantage of celebrated names to vouch facts that appear incredible or uncertain. The Greeks and Romans made an illustrious figure in poetry, rhetoric, and all the fine arts; but they were little better than novices in natural history. More than half of the globe was to them what the *Terra Australis incognita* is to us; and imagination operates without control when it is not checked by knowledge: the ignorant at the same time are delighted with wonders; and the more wonderful a story is, the more welcome it is made. This may serve as an apology for ancient writers, even when they relate and believe facts to us incredible. Men at that period were ignorant, in a great measure, of nature, and of the limits of her operations. One concession will be made to me, that the writers mentioned who report things at second hand, are much more excusable than the earliest of our modern travellers, who pretend to vouch endless wonders from their own knowledge. Natural history, that of man especially, is of late years much ripen-

ed: no improbable tale is suffered to pass without a strict examination; and I have been careful to adopt no facts but what are vouched by late travellers and writers of credit. Were it true what Diodorus Siculus reports on the authority of Agatharchides of Cnidus, concerning the Ichthyophages on the east coast of Afric, it would be a more pregnant proof of a distinct race of men than any I have discovered. They are described to be so stupid, that even when their wives and children are killed in their sight, they stand insensible, and give no signs either of anger or of compassion. This I cannot believe upon so slight testimony; and the Greeks and Romans were at that time extremely credulous, being less acquainted with neighbouring nations, than we are with the Antipodes. The Balearic islands, Majorca, Minorca, Yvica, are at no great distance from Sicily; and yet Diodorus the Sicilian reports of the inhabitants, that at the solemnization of marriage all the male friends, and even the household servants, lay with the bride before the bridegroom was admitted. *Credat Judeus appella.* It would not be much more difficult to make me believe what is said by Pliny of the Blemmyans, that they had no head, and that the mouth and eyes were in the breast; or of the Arimaspi, who had but one eye, placed in the middle of the forehead; or of the Astomi, who having no mouth, could neither eat nor drink, but lived upon smelling; or of a thousand other absurdities which Pliny relates, with a grave face, in the 6th book of his natural history, cap. 30. and in the 7th book, cap. 2.

Thus upon an extensive survey of the inhabited parts of our globe, many nations are found differing so widely from each other, not only in complexion, in features, in shape, and in other external circumstances, but in temper and disposition, particularly in two capital articles, courage and the treatment of strangers, that even the certainty of there being different races could not make one expect more striking differences. Doth M. Buffon think

it

it sufficient, barely to say, that such differences may possibly be the effect of climate, or of other accidental causes? The presumption is, that the differences subsisting at present have always subsisted; which ought to be held as true, till positive evidence be brought of the contrary: instead of which we are put off with bare suppositions and possibilities.

But not to rest entirely upon presumptive evidence, to me it appears clear from the very frame of the human body, that there must be different races of men fitted for different climates. Few animals are more affected than men generally are, not only with change of seasons in the same climate, but with change of weather in the same season. Can such a being be fitted for all climates equally? Impossible. A man must at least be hardened by nature against the flighter changes of seasons or weather: he ought to be altogether insensible of such changes. Yet from Sir John Pringle's observations on the diseases of the army, to go no further, it appears, that even military men, who ought of all to be the hardiest, are greatly affected by them. Horses and horned cattle sleep on the bare ground, wet or dry, without harm; and yet are not made for every climate: can a man be made for every climate, who is so much more delicate, that he cannot sleep on wet ground without hazard of some mortal disease?

But the argument I chiefly rely on is, That were all men of one species, there never could have existed, without a miracle, different kinds, such as exist at present. Giving allowance for every supposable variation of climate, or of other natural causes, what can follow, as observed about the dog-kind, but endless varieties among individuals, as among tulips in a garden, so as that no individual shall resemble another. Instead of which we find men of different kinds, the individuals of each kind remarkably uniform, and differing not less remarkably from the individuals of every

other kind. Uniformity and permanency are the offspring of design, never of chance.

There is another argument that appears also to have weight: Horses with respect to size, shape, and spirit, differ widely in different climates. But let a male and a female of whatever climate be carried to a country where horses are in perfection, their progeny will improve gradually, and will acquire in time the perfection of their kind. Is not this a proof, that all horses are of one kind? If so, men are not all of one kind; for if a White mix with a Black in whatever climate, or a Hottentot with a Samoide, the result will not be either an improvement of the kind, or the contrary; but a mongrel breed differing from both parents. It is thus ascertained beyond any rational doubt, that there are different races or kinds of men, and that these races or kinds are naturally fitted for different climates: whence we have reason to conclude, that originally each kind was placed in its proper climate, whatever change may have happened in later times by war or commerce.

There is a remarkable fact that confirms the foregoing conjectures. As far back as history goes, or tradition kept alive by history, the earth was inhabited by savages divided into many small tribes, each tribe having a language peculiar to itself. Is it not natural to suppose, that these original tribes were different races of men, placed in proper climates, and left to form their own language?

Upon summing up the whole particulars mentioned above, would one hesitate a moment to adopt the following opinion, were there no counterbalancing evidence, viz. "That God created many pairs of the human race, differing from each other both externally and internally; that he fitted these pairs for different climates, and placed each pair in its proper climate; that the peculiarities of the original pairs were preserved entire in their descendents;

“descendents; who, having no assistance but their natural talents, were left to gather knowledge from experience, and in particular were left (each tribe) to form a language for itself; that signs were sufficient for the original pairs, without any language but what nature suggests; and that a language was formed gradually, as a tribe increased in numbers, and in different occupations, to make speech necessary?” But this opinion, however plausible, we are not permitted to adopt; being taught a different lesson by revelation, viz. That God created but a single pair of the human species. Tho’ we cannot doubt of the authority of Moses, yet his account of the creation of man is not a little puzzling, as it seems to contradict every one of the facts mentioned above. According to that account, different races of men were not formed, nor were men formed originally for different climates. All men must have spoken the same language, viz. that of our first parents. And what of all seems the most contradictory to that account, is the savage state: Adam, as Moses informs us, was endued by his Maker with an eminent degree of knowledge; and he certainly was an excellent preceptor to his children and their progeny, among whom he lived many generations. Whence then the degeneracy of all men unto the savage state? To account for that dismal catastrophe, mankind must have suffered some terrible convulsion.

That terrible convulsion is revealed to us in the history of the tower of Babel, contained in the 11th chapter of Genesis, which is, That for many centuries after the deluge, the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech; that they united to build a city on a plain in the land of Shinar, with a tower whose top might reach unto heaven; that the Lord beholding the people to be one, and to have all one language, and that nothing would be restrained from them which they imagined to do, confounded their language, that they might not understand one another;

“and

"and scattered them abroad upon the face of all the earth." Here light breaks forth in the midst of darkness. By confounding the language of men, and scattering them abroad upon the face of all the earth, they were rendered savages. And to harden them for their new habitations, it was necessary that they should be divided into different kinds, fitted for different climates. Without an immediate change of constitution, the builders of Babel could not possibly have subsisted in the burning region of Guinea, nor in the frozen region of Lapland; houses not being prepared, nor any other convenience to protect them against a destructive climate. Against this history it has indeed been urged, "that the circumstances mentioned evince it to be purely an allegory; that men never were so frantic as to think of building a tower whose top might reach to heaven; and that it is grossly absurd, taking the matter literally, that the Almighty was afraid of men, and reduced to the necessity of saving himself by a miracle." But that this is a real history, must necessarily be admitted, as the confusion of Babel is the only known fact that can reconcile sacred and profane history.

And this leads us to consider the diversity of languages *. If the

* As the social state is essential to man, and speech to the social state, the wisdom of providence in fitting men for acquiring that necessary art, deserves more attention than is commonly bestowed on it. The Orang Outang has the external organs of speech in perfection; and many are puzzled to account why it never speaks. But the external organs of speech make but a small part of the necessary apparatus. The faculty of imitating sounds is an essential part; and wonderful would that faculty appear, were it not rendered familiar by practice: a child of two or three years, is able, by nature alone without the least instruction, to adapt its organs of speech to every articulate sound; and a child of four or five years can pitch its windpipe so as to emit a sound of any elevation, which enables it with an ear to imitate the songs it hears. But above all the other parts, sense and understanding

the common language of men had not been confounded upon their attempting the tower of Babel, I affirm, that there never could have been but one language. Antiquaries constantly suppose a migrating spirit in the original inhabitants of this earth; not only without evidence, but contrary to all probability. Men never desert their connections nor their country without necessity: fear of enemies and of wild beasts, as well as the attraction of society, are more than sufficient to restrain them from wandering; not to mention that savages are peculiarly fond of their natal soil *. The first migrations were probably occasioned by factions and

derstanding are essential to speech. A parrot can pronounce articulate sounds, and it has frequently an inclination to speak; but, for want of understanding, none of the kind can form a single sentence. Has an Orang Outang understanding to form a mental proposition? has he a faculty to express that proposition in sounds? and supposing him able to express what he sees and hears, what would he make of the connective and disjunctive particles?

* With respect to the supposed migrating spirit, even Bochart must yield to Kempfer in boldness of conjecture. After proving, from difference of language, and from other circumstances, that Japan was not peopled by the Chinese, Kempfer without the least hesitation settles a colony there of those who attempted the tower of Babel. Nay he traces most minutely their road to Japan; and concludes, that they must have travelled with great expedition, because their language has no tincture of any other. He did not think it necessary to explain, what temptation they had to wander so far from home; nor why they settled in an island, not preferable either in soil or climate to many countries they must have traversed.

An ingenious French writer observes, that plausible reasons would lead one to conjecture, that men were more early polished in islands than in continents; as people, crowded together, soon find the necessity of laws to restrain them from mischief. And yet, says he, the manners of islanders and their laws are commonly the latest formed. A very simple reflection would have unfolded the mystery.

and civil wars; the next by commerce. Greece affords instances of the former, Phœnicia of the latter. Unless upon such occasions, members of a family or of a tribe will never retire farther from their fellows than is necessary for food; and by retiring gradually, they lose neither their connections nor their manners, far less their language, which is in constant exercise. As far back as history carries us, tribes without number are discovered, each having a language peculiar to itself. Strabo (a) reports, that the Albanians were divided into several tribes, differing in external appearance and in language. Cæsar found in Gaul several such tribes; and Tacitus records the names of many tribes in Germany. There are a multitude of American tribes that to this day continue distinct from each other, and have each a different language. The mother-tongues at present, tho' numerous, bear no proportion to what formerly existed. We find original tribes gradually enlarging; by conquest frequently, and more frequently by the union of weak tribes for mutual defence. Such events promote one language instead of many. The Celtic tongue, once extensive, is at present confined to the highlands of Scotland, to Wales, to Britany, and to a part of Ireland. In a few centuries, it will share the fate of many other original tongues: it will be totally forgotten.

If men had not been scattered every where upon the confusion of Babel, another particular must have occurred, differing not less from what has really happened than that now mentioned.

Many many centuries did men exist without thinking of navigation. That art was not invented till men, straitened in their quarters upon the continent, thought of occupying adjacent islands.

(a) Book 2.

As paradise is conjectured to have been situated in the heart of Asia, the surrounding regions, for the reason above given, must have been first peopled; and the civilization and improvements of the mother-country were undoubtedly carried along to every new settlement. In particular, the colonies planted in America, the South-sea islands, and the *Terra Australis incognita*, must have been highly polished; because, being at the greatest distance, they probably were the latest. And yet these and other remote people, the Mexicans and Peruvians excepted, remain to this day in the original savage state of hunting and fishing.

Thus, had not men wildly attempted to build a tower whose top might reach to heaven, all men would not only have spoken the same language, but would have made the same progress toward maturity of knowledge and civilization. That deplorable event reversed all nature: by scattering men over the face of all the earth, it deprived them of society, and rendered them savages. From that state of degeneracy, they have been emerging gradually. Some nations, stimulated by their own nature, or by their climate, have made a rapid progress; some have proceeded more slowly; and some continue savages. To trace out that progress toward maturity in different nations, is the subject of the present undertaking.

F 2

S K E T C H

S K E T C H I I .

Progress of Men with respect to Food and Po- PULATION.

IN temperate climates, the original food of men was fruits that grow without culture, and the flesh of land-animals. As such animals become shy when often hunted, there is a contrivance of nature, no less simple than effectual, which engages men to bear with cheerfulness the fatigues of hunting, and the uncertainty of capture; and that is, an appetite for hunting. Hunger alone is not sufficient: savages, who act by sense not by foresight, move not when the stomach is full; and it would be too late when the stomach is empty, to form a hunting-party. As this appetite belongs to every savage who depends on hunting for procuring food; it is one instance, among many, of providential wisdom, in adapting the internal constitution of man to his external circumstances. The appetite for hunting, tho' among us little necessary for food, is, to this day, visible in our young men, high and low, rich and poor. Natural propensities may be rendered faint or obscure, but never are totally eradicated.

It is probable, that fish was not early the food of man. Water is not our element; and savages probably did not attempt to draw any food from the sea or from rivers, till land-animals turned scarce. Plutarch in his *Symposiacs* observes, that the Syrians and Greeks of old abstained from fish. Menelaus (a) complains,

(a) Book 4. of the *Odyssey*.

that

that his companions had been reduced by hunger to that food; and tho' the Grecian camp, at the siege of Troy; was on the sea-shore, there is not in Homer a single hint of their feeding on fish. We learn from Dion Cassius, that the Caledonians did not eat fish, tho' they had them in plenty; which is confirmed by Adammannus, a Scotch historian, in his life of St Columba. The ancient Caledonians depended almost entirely on deer for food, because in a cold country the fruits that grow spontaneously afford very little nourishment; and domestic animals, which at present so much abound, were not early known in the north of Britain.

Antiquaries talk of acorns, nuts, and other shell-fruits, as the only vegetable food that men had originally; overlooking wheat, rice, barley, &c. which must, from the creation, have grown spontaneously: for surely, when agriculture first commenced, seeds of these plants were not procured by a miracle *. The Lapland-

* Writers upon natural history have been solicitous to discover the original climate of these plants; but without much success. The original climate of plants left to nature, cannot be a secret: but in countries well peopled, the plants mentioned are not left to nature; the seeds are carefully gathered, and stored up for food. As this practice could not fail to make these seeds scarce, agriculture was early thought of, which, by introducing plants into new soils and new climates, has rendered the original climate obscure. If we can trace that climate, it must be in regions destitute of inhabitants, or but thinly peopled. The Sioux, a very small tribe in North-America, possess a vast country, where oats grow spontaneously in meadows and on the sides of rivers, which make part of their food, without necessity of agriculture. While the French possessed Port Dauphin in the island of Madagascar, they raised excellent wheat. That station was deserted many years ago; and wheat to this day grows naturally among the grass in great vigour. In the country about Mount Tabor in Palestine, barley and oats grow spontaneously. In the kingdom of Siam, there are many spots where rice grows spontaneously, year after year, without any culture. Diodorus Siculus is our authority for saying, that in the territory of Leontinum, and in other parts of Sicily, wheat grew wild without any culture. And it does to this day about Mount

Etna.

ers,

ers, possessing a country where corn will not grow, make bread of the inner bark of trees; and Linneus reports, that swine there fatten on that food, as well as in Sweden upon corn.

Plenty of food procured by hunting and fishing, promotes population: but as consumption of food increases with population, wild animals, sorely persecuted, become not only more rare but more shy. Men, thus pinched for food, are excited to try other means for supplying their wants. A fawn, a kid, or a lamb, taken alive, and tamed for amusement, suggested probably flocks and herds, and introduced the shepherd-state. Changes are not perfected but by slow degrees: hunting and fishing continue for a long time favourite occupations; and the few animals that are domesticated, serve as a common stock to be distributed among individuals, according to their wants. But as the idle and indolent, tho' the least deserving, are thus the greatest consumers of the common stock, an improvement was suggested, that every family should rear a stock for themselves. Men by that politic regulation being taught to rely on their own industry, display'd the hoarding-principle, which multiplied flocks and herds exceedingly. And thus the shepherd-state was perfected, plenty of food being supplied at home, without ranging the woods or the waters. Hunting and fishing being no longer necessary for food, became an amusement merely, and a gratification of the original appetite for hunting.

The finger of God may be clearly traced in the provision made of animal food for man. Gramenivorous animals, perhaps all, make palatable and wholesome food. I except not the horse: some nations feed on it; others do not, because it is more profitable by its labour. Carnivorous animals, generally speaking, make not wholesome food nor palatable. The first-mentioned animals are gentle, and easily domesticated: the latter are fierce, not easily tamed, and uncertain in temper when tamed. Grass grows every
where

where in temperate regions; and men beside can multiply animal food without end, by training domestic animals to live on turnip, carrot, potato, and other roots, &c. Herodotus adds the following admirable reflection: "We may rationally conjecture, that divine providence has rendered extremely prolific such creatures as are naturally fearful, and serve for food; lest they should be destroyed by constant consumption: whereas the rapacious and cruel are almost barren. The hare, which is the prey of beasts, birds, and men, is a great breeder: a lion-ness, on the contrary, the strongest and fiercest of beasts, brings forth but once."

The shepherd-state is friendly to population. Men by plenty of food multiply apace; and in process of time neighbouring tribes, straitened in their pasture, go to war for extension of territory, or migrate to grounds not yet occupied. Necessity, the mother of invention, suggested agriculture. When corn growing spontaneously was rendered scarce by consumption, it was an obvious thought to propagate it by art: nature was the guide, which carries on its work of propagation with seeds, that drop from plants in their maturity, and spring up new plants. As the land was possessed in common, the seed of course was sown in common, and stored in a common repository to be parcelled out among individuals in want, as the common stock of animals had been formerly. We have for our authority Diodorus Siculus, that the Celtiberians divided their land annually among individuals, to be laboured for the use of the public, and that the product was stored up, and distributed from time to time among the necessitous. A lasting division of the land among the members of the state, securing to each man the product of his own skill and labour, was a great spur to industry, and multiplied food exceedingly. Population made a rapid progress, and government became

came an art; for agriculture and commerce cannot flourish without salutary laws.

Natural fruits ripen to greater perfection in a temperate than in a cold climate, and cultivation is more easy; which circumstances make it highly probably, that agriculture became first an art in temperate climes. The culture of corn was so early known in Greece, as to make a branch of its fabulous history: in Egypt it must have been coeval with the inhabitants; for while the Nile overflows, they cannot subsist without corn (a). Nor without corn could the ancient monarchies of Assyria and Babylon have been so populous and powerful as they are said to have been. In the northern parts of Europe, wheat, barley, pease, and perhaps oats, are foreign plants: as the climate is not friendly to corn, agriculture must have crept northward by slow degrees; and even at present, it requires no small portion both of skill and industry to bring corn to maturity in such a climate. Hence it may be inferred with certainty, that the shepherd-state continued longer in northern climates than in those nearer the sun. Cold countries however are friendly to population; and the northern people, multiplying beyond the food that can be supplied by flocks and herds, were compelled to throw off many swarms in search of new habitations. Their frequent migrations were for many years a dreadful scourge to neighbouring kingdoms. People, amazed at the multitude of the invaders, judged, that the countries from whence they issued must have been exceedingly populous; and hence the North was termed *officina gentium*; but scarcity of food in the shepherd-state was the true cause. The north of Europe, in all probability, is as well peopled at present as ever it was, tho' its migrations have ceased, corn and commerce having put an end

(a) Historical Law-tracts, tract 1.

to that pestilence *. Denmark at present feeds 2,000,000 of inhabitants, Sweden, according to a list made up *anno* 1760, 2,383,113; and these countries must be much more populous than of old, when over-run with immense woods, and agriculture utterly unknown. Had the Danes and Norwegians been acquainted with agriculture in the ninth and tenth centuries, when they poured out multitudes upon their neighbours, they would not have ventured their lives in frail vessels upon a tempestuous ocean, in order to distress nations who were not their enemies. But hunger is a cogent motive; and hunger gave to these pirates superiority in arms above every nation that enjoyed plenty at home. Luckily such depredations must have intervals; for as they necessarily occasion great havock even among the victors, the remainder finding sufficiency of food at home, rest there till an increasing population force them again to action †. Agriculture,

* *Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.* Montesquieu accounts as follows for the great swarms of Barbarians that overwhelmed the Roman empire. “Ces ef-
faims de Barbares qui fortirent autrefois du nord, ne paroissent plus aujour-
d’hui. Les violences des Romains avoient fait retirer les peuple du midi au
nord : tandis que la force qui les contenoit subsista, ils y restèrent ; quand elle fut
affoiblie, ils se repandirent de toutes parts.” *Grandeur des Romains, c. 16.*
[In English thus : “The swarms of Barbarians who poured formerly from the
north, appear no more. The violence of the Roman arms had driven those
nations from the south towards the north : there they remained during the
subsistence of that force which retained them ; but that being once weakened,
they spread abroad to every quarter.”] — It has quite escaped him, that men
cannot, like water, be dam’d up without being fed.

† Joannes Magnus, in the 8th book of his history of the Goths, mentions, that a third part of the Swedes, being compelled by famine to leave their native country, founded the kingdom of the Longobards in Italy.

which fixes people to a spot, is an invincible obstacle to migration; and happy it is for Europe, that agriculture, now universally diffused, has put an end for ever to such migrations: the northern people find occupation and sustenance at home, without infesting others. Agriculture is a great blessing: it not only affords us food in plenty, but secures the fruits of our industry from hungry and rapacious invaders *.

That the progress above traced must have proceeded from some vigorous impulse will be admitted, considering the prevailing influence of custom: once hunters, men will always be hunters, till they be forc'd out of that state by some overpowering cause. Hunger, the cause here assigned, is of all the most overpowering; and the same cause, overcoming indolence and idleness, has introduced manufactures, commerce, and variety of arts †.

The

* Mahomet Bey, King of Tunis, was dethroned by his subjects; but having the reputation of the philosopher's stone, he was restored by the Dey of Algiers, upon promising to communicate the secret to him. Mahomet sent a plough with great pomp and ceremony, intimating, that agriculture is the strength of a kingdom, and that the only philosopher's stone is a good crop, which may be easily converted into gold.

† Buffon discoursing of America, "Is it not singular," says he, "that in a world composed almost wholly of savages, there never should have been any society or commerce between them and the animals about them? There was not a domestic animal in America when discovered by Columbus, except among the polished people of Mexico and Peru. Is not this a proof, that man, in his savage state, is but a sort of brute animal, having no faculties but to provide for his subsistence, by attacking the weak, and avoiding the strong; and having no idea of his superiority over other animals, which he never once thinks of bringing under subjection? This is the more surprising, as most of the American animals are by nature docile and timid." Our author, without being sensible of it, lays

The progress here delineated has, in all temperate climates of the old world, been precisely uniform; but it has been different in the extremes of cold and hot climates. In very cold regions, which produce little vegetable food for man, the hunter-state was originally essential. In temperate regions, as observed above, men subsisted partly on vegetable food, which is more and more plentiful in proportion to the heat of the climate. In the torrid zone, natural fruits are produced in such plenty and perfection, as to be more than sufficient for a moderate population: and in case of extraordinary population, the transition to husbandry is easy. There are found accordingly in every populous country of the torrid zone, crops of rice, maize, roots, and other vegetable food, raised by the hand of man. As hunting becomes thus less and less necessary in the progress from cold to hot countries, the appetite for hunting keeps pace with that progress: it is vigorous in very cold countries, where men depend on hunting for food: it is less vigorous in temperate countries, where they are partly fed with natural fruits; and there is scarce any vestige of it in hot countries, where vegetables are the food of men, and where meat is an article of luxury. The original occupation of savages, both in cold and temperate climates, is hunting, altogether essential in the former as the only means of procuring food. The next step of the progress in both, is the occupation of a shepherd; and there the progress stops short in very cold regions, unfit for corn. Lap-

lays a foundation for a satisfactory answer to these questions, by what he adds, viz. That in the whole compass of America, when discovered by the Spaniards, there were not half the number of people that are in Europe; and that such scarcity of men favoured greatly the propagation of wild animals, which had few enemies and much food. Was it not obvious to conclude from these premises, that while men, who by nature are fond of hunting, have game in plenty, they never think of turning shepherds?

land in particular produces no vegetable but moss, which is the food of no animal but of the rain-deer. This circumstance solely is what renders Lapland habitable by men. Without rain-deer, the sea-coasts within the reach of fish would admit some inhabitants; but the inland parts would be a desert. As the swiftness of that animal makes it not an easy prey, the taming it for food must have been early attempted; and its natural docility made the attempt succeed. It yields to no other animal in usefulness: it is equal to a horse for draught: its flesh is excellent food; and the female gives milk more nourishing than that of a cow: its fur is fine; and the leather made of its skin, is both soft and durable. In Tartary, tho' a great part of it lies in a temperate zone, there is little corn. As far back as tradition reaches, the Tartars have had flocks and herds; and yet, in a great measure, they not only continue hunters, but retain the ferocity of that state: they are not fond of being shepherds, and have not any knowledge of husbandry. This in appearance is singular; but nothing happens without a cause. Tartary is one continued mountain from west to east, rising high above the countries to the south; and declining gradually to the northern ocean, without a single hill to intercept the bitter blasts of the north. A few spots excepted, a tree above the size of a shrub cannot live in it *. In Europe, the mountains of Norway and Lapland are a comfortable screen against the north wind: whence it is, that the ground about Stockholm (a) pro-

* May not a similar situation in some parts of North America, be partly the occasion of the cold that is felt there, beyond what Europe feels in the same latitude?

(a) Latitude 59.

duces both trees and corn; and even about Abo (a) the climate is tolerable. Great Tartary abounds with pasture; but extreme cold renders it very little capable of corn. Thro' all Chinese Tartary, even as low as the 43d degree of latitude, the frost continues seven or eight months every year; and that country, tho' in the latitude of France, is as cold as Iceland; the causes of which are its nitrous soil, and its height without any shelter from the west wind that has passed through an immense continent extremely cold. A certain place near the source of the river Kavamhuran, and within 80 leagues of the great wall, was found by Father Verbeist to be 3000 geometrical paces above the level of the sea. Thus the Tartars, like the Laplanders, are chained to the shepherd-state, and can never advance to be husbandmen. If population among them ever be so great as to require more food than the shepherd-state can supply, migration will be their only resource.

In every step of the progress, the torrid zone differs. We have no evidence that either the hunter or shepherd state were ever known there: the inhabitants at present subsist upon vegetable food; and probably did so from the beginning. In Manila, one of the Philippine islands, the trees bud, blossom, and bear fruit, all the year round. The natives, driven from the sea-coast to the inland parts, have no particular place of abode, but live under the shelter of trees, which afford them food as well as habitation; and when the fruit is consumed in one spot, they remove to another. The orange, lemon, and other European trees, bear fruit twice a-year: a sprig planted bears fruit within the year. And this picture of Manila answers to numberless places in the torrid zone. The Marian or Ladrone islands are extremely populous; and yet

(a) Latitude 61.

the inhabitants live entirely on fish, fruits, and roots. The inhabitants of the new Philippine islands live on cocoa-nuts, salads, roots, and fish. The inland negroes make but one meal a-day, which is in the evening. Their diet is plain, consisting mostly of rice, fruits, and roots. The island of Otaheite is healthy, the people tall and well made; and by temperance, vegetables and fish being their chief nourishment, they live to a good old age, with scarce any ailment. There is no such thing known among them as rotten teeth: the very smell of wine or spirits is disagreeable; and they never deal in tobacco nor spiceries. In many places Indian corn is the chief nourishment, which every man plants for himself. The inhabitants of Biledulgerid and the desert of Zaara have but two meals a-day, one in the morning, and one in the evening. Being temperate, and strangers to the diseases of luxury and idleness, they generally live to a great age. Sixty with them is the prime of life, as thirty is in Europe. An inhabitant of Madagascar will travel two or three days without any food but a sugar cane. There is indeed little appetite for animal food in hot climates; tho' beef and fowl have in small quantities been introduced to the tables of the great, as articles of luxury. In America are observable some variations from the progress; but these are reserved for a separate sketch (a).

With respect to population in particular, that plenty of food is its chief cause, may be illustrated by the following calculation. The southern provinces of China produce two crops of rice in a year, sometimes three; and an acre well cultivated gives food to ten mouths. The peasants go almost naked; and the better sort wear but a single garment made of cotton, of which as much is produced upon an acre as may cloath four or five hundred persons. Hence the extreme populousness of China and other rice coun-

(a) Book 2. sketch 12.

tries. The Cassave root, which serves the Americans for bread, is produced in such plenty, that an acre of it will feed more persons than six acres of wheat. It is not then for want of food that America is ill peopled. That Negroland is well peopled is past doubt, considering the great annual draughts from that country to America, without any apparent diminution of numbers. Instances are not extremely rare of 200 children born to one man by his different wives. Food must be extremely plentiful to enable a man to maintain so many children. It would require extraordinary skill and labour to make Europe so populous: an acre and an half of wheat is barely sufficient to maintain a single family of peasants; and their cloathing requires many more acres. A country of savages, who live chiefly by hunting, must be very thin of inhabitants; as 10,000 or double that number of acres are no more than sufficient for maintaining a single family. If the multiplication of animals depended chiefly on fecundity, wolves would be more numerous than sheep: a great proportion of the latter are deprived of the procreating power, and many more of them are killed than of the former: yet we see every where large flocks of sheep, seldom a wolf; for what reason, other than that the former have plenty of food, the latter very little? A wolf resembles a savage who lives by hunting, and consumes the game of five or six hundred acres.

Waving the question, Whether the human race be the offspring of one pair, or of many, it appears the intention of Providence, that the earth should be peopled, and population be kept up by the ordinary means of procreation. By these means a tribe soon becomes too populous for the primitive state of hunting and fishing: it may even become too populous for the shepherd-state; but probably a nation can scarce be too populous for husbandry. In the two former states, food must decrease in quantity as consumers increase in number: but agriculture has the signal property
of

the inhabitants live entirely on fish, fruits, and roots. The inhabitants of the new Philippine islands live on cocoa-nuts, salads, roots, and fish. The inland negroes make but one meal a-day, which is in the evening. Their diet is plain, consisting mostly of rice, fruits, and roots. The island of Otaheite is healthy, the people tall and well made; and by temperance, vegetables and fish being their chief nourishment, they live to a good old age, with scarce any ailment. There is no such thing known among them as rotten teeth: the very smell of wine or spirits is disagreeable; and they never deal in tobacco nor spices. In many places Indian corn is the chief nourishment, which every man plants for himself. The inhabitants of Biledulgerid and the desert of Zaara have but two meals a-day, one in the morning, and one in the evening. Being temperate, and strangers to the diseases of luxury and idleness, they generally live to a great age. Sixty with them is the prime of life, as thirty is in Europe. An inhabitant of Madagascar will travel two or three days without any food but a sugar cane. There is indeed little appetite for animal food in hot climates; tho' beef and fowl have in small quantities been introduced to the tables of the great, as articles of luxury. In America are observable some variations from the progress; but these are reserved for a separate sketch (a).

With respect to population in particular, that plenty of food is its chief cause, may be illustrated by the following calculation. The southern provinces of China produce two crops of rice in a year, sometimes three; and an acre well cultivated gives food to ten mouths. The peasants go almost naked; and the better sort wear but a single garment made of cotton, of which as much is produced upon an acre as may cloath four or five hundred persons. Hence the extreme populousness of China and other rice coun-

(a) Book 2, sketch 12.

tries. The Cassave root, which serves the Americans for bread, is produced in such plenty, that an acre of it will feed more persons than six acres of wheat. It is not then for want of food that America is ill peopled. That Negroland is well peopled is past doubt, considering the great annual draughts from that country to America, without any apparent diminution of numbers. Instances are not extremely rare of 200 children born to one man by his different wives. Food must be extremely plentiful to enable a man to maintain so many children. It would require extraordinary skill and labour to make Europe so populous: an acre and an half of wheat is barely sufficient to maintain a single family of peasants; and their cloathing requires many more acres. A country of savages, who live chiefly by hunting, must be very thin of inhabitants; as 10,000 or double that number of acres are no more than sufficient for maintaining a single family. If the multiplication of animals depended chiefly on fecundity, wolves would be more numerous than sheep: a great proportion of the latter are deprived of the procreating power, and many more of them are killed than of the former: yet we see every where large flocks of sheep, seldom a wolf; for what reason, other than that the former have plenty of food, the latter very little? A wolf resembles a savage who lives by hunting, and consumes the game of five or six hundred acres.

Waving the question, Whether the human race be the offspring of one pair, or of many, it appears the intention of Providence, that the earth should be peopled, and population be kept up by the ordinary means of procreation. By these means a tribe soon becomes too populous for the primitive state of hunting and fishing: it may even become too populous for the shepherd-state; but probably a nation can scarce be too populous for husbandry. In the two former states, food must decrease in quantity as consumers increase in number: but agriculture has the signal property of

of producing, by industry, food in proportion to the number of consumers. In fact the greatest quantities of corn and of cattle are commonly produced in the most populous districts, where each family has its proportion of land. An ancient Roman, sober and industrious, made a shift to maintain his family on the product of a few acres*.

The bounty given in Britain for exporting corn is friendly to population in two respects; first, because husbandry requires many hands; and, next, because the bounty lowers the price of corn at home. To give a bounty for exporting cattle would obstruct population; because pasture requires few hands, and exportation would raise the price of cattle at home. From the single port of Cork, an. 1735, were exported 107,161 barrels of beef, 7379 barrels of pork, 13,461 casks of butter, and 85,727 firkins of the same commodity. Thus a large portion of Ireland is set apart for feeding other nations. What addition of strength would it not be to Britain, if that large quantity of food were consumed at home by useful manufacturers!

Lapland is but thinly inhabited even for the shepherd-state, the country being capable of maintaining a greater number of rain-deer, and consequently a greater number of the human species than are found in it. At the same time, the Laplanders are well acquainted with private property; every family has tame rain-deer of their own, to the extent sometimes of four or five hundred. They indeed seem to have more rain-deer than there is a demand for. Why then is Lapland so thinly peopled? Either

* Scotland must have been very ill peopled in the days of its fifth James, when at one hunting in the high country of Roxburghshire, that Prince killed three hundred and sixty red-deer; and in Athol, at another time, six hundred, besides roes, wolves, foxes, and wild cats.

it must have been but lately planted, or the inhabitants are not prolific. I incline to the latter, upon the authority of Scheffer. Tartary is also but thinly peopled; and as I find not that the Tartars are less prolific than their neighbours, it is probable that Tartary, being the most barren country in Asia, has not been early planted. At the same time population has been much retarded by the restless and roaming spirit of that people: it is true, they have been forced into the shepherd-state by want of food; but so averse are they to the sedentary life of a shepherd, that they trust their cattle to slaves, and persevere in their favourite occupation of hunting. This disposition has been a dreadful pest to the human species, the Tartars having made more extensive conquests, and destroy'd more men, than any other nation known in history: more cruel than tigers, they seem'd to have no delight but in blood and massacre, without any regard either to sex or age*. Luckily for the human species, rich spoils dazzled their eyes, and roused an appetite for wealth. Avarice is sometimes productive of good: it moved these monsters to sell the conquered people for slaves, which preserved the lives of millions. Conquests, however successful, cannot go on for ever; they are not accomplished without great loss of men; and the conquests of the Tartars depopulated their country.

But as some centuries have elapsed without any considerable eruption of that fiery people, their numbers must at present be considerable by the ordinary progress of population. Have we not reason to dread new eruptions, like what formerly happened? Our foreknowledge of future events extends not far; but so far as it

* When the Tartars under Genghizkan conquered China, it was seriously deliberated, whether they should not kill all the inhabitants, and convert that vast country into pasture-fields for their cattle.

extends, we have nothing to fear from that quarter. The Tartars subdued a great part of the world by ferocity and undaunted courage, supported by liberty and independence. They acknowledged Genghizkan as their leader in war; but were as far from being slaves, as the Franks were when they conquered Gaul. Tamerlane again enjoyed but a substituted power, and never had the audacity to assume the title of Chan or Emperor. But the Tartars have submitted to the same yoke of despotism that their ferocity imposed upon others; and being now governed by a number of petty tyrants, their courage is broken by slavery, and they are no longer formidable to the rest of mankind *.

Depopulation enters into the present sketch as well as population. The latter follows not with greater certainty from equality of property, than the former from inequality. In every great state, where the people, by prosperity and opulence, are sunk into voluptuousness, we hear daily complaints of depopulation. Cookery depopulates like a pestilence; because when it becomes an art, it brings within the compass of one stomach what is sufficient for ten in days of temperance; and is so far worse than a pestilence, that the people never recruit again. The inhabitants of France devour at present more food than the same number did

* "Gallos in bellis floruisse accepimus," says Tacitus in his life of Agricola; "mox segnitie cum otio intravit, amissa virtute pariter ac libertate." — [*In Eng. list thus*: "We have heard that the Gauls formerly made a figure in war; but becoming a prey to indolence, the consequence of peace, they lost at once their valour and their liberty."] — Spain, which defended itself with great bravery against the Romans, became an easy prey to the Vandals in the fifth century. When attacked by the Romans, it was divided into many free states: when attacked by the Vandals, it was enervated by slavery under Roman despotism.

formerly.

formerly. The like is observable in Britain, and in every country where luxury abounds. Remedies are proposed and put in practice, celibacy disgraced, marriage encouraged, and rewards given for a numerous offspring. All in vain! The only effectual remedies are to encourage husbandry, and to repress luxury. Olivares hoped to repeople Spain by encouraging matrimony. Abderam, a Mahometan king of Cordova, was a better politician. By encouraging industry, and procuring plenty of food, he re-peopled his kingdom in less than thirty years.*

Luxury is a deadly enemy to population, not only by intercepting food from the industrious, but by weakening the power of procreation. Indolence accompanies voluptuousness, or rather is a branch of it: women of rank seldom move, but in changing place employ others to move them; and a woman enervated by indolence and intemperance, is ill qualified for the severe labour of child-bearing. Hence it is, that people of rank, where luxury prevails, are not prolific. This infirmity not only prevents population, but increases luxury, by accumulating wealth among a few blood-relations. A barren woman among the labouring poor, is a wonder. Could women of rank be persuaded to make a trial, they would find more self-enjoyment in temperance and exercise, than in the most refined luxury; and would have no cause to envy others the blessing of a numerous and healthy offspring.

Luxury is not a greater enemy to population by enervating men and women, than despotism is by reducing them to slavery, and

* A foundling hospital is a greater enemy to population than liberty to expose infants, which is permitted to parents in China, and in some other countries. Both of them indeed encourage matrimony: but in such hospitals, thousands perish yearly beyond the ordinary proportion; whereas few infants perish by the liberty of exposing them, parental affection generally prevailing over the distress of poverty. And, upon the whole, population gains more by that liberty than it loses.

destroying industry. Despotism is a greater pest to the human species than an Egyptian plague; for by rendering men miserable, it weakens both the appetite for procreation and the power. Free states, on the contrary, are always populous: a man who is happy longs for children to make them also happy; and industry enables him to accomplish his purpose. This observation is verified from the history of Greece, and of the Lesser Asia: the inhabitants anciently were free and extremely numerous: the present inhabitants, reduced to slavery, make a very poor figure with respect to numbers. A pestilence destroys those only who exist, and the loss is soon repaired; but despotism, as above observed, strikes at the very root of population.

An overflowing quantity of money in circulation, is another cause of depopulation. In a nation that grows rich by commerce, the price of labour increases with the quantity of circulating money, which of course raises the price of manufactures; and manufacturers who cannot find a vent for their high-rated goods in foreign markets, must give over business, and commence beggars, or retire to another country where they may have a prospect of success. But luckily, there is a remedy in that case to prevent depopulation: land is cultivated to greater perfection by the spade than by the plough; and the more plentiful crops produced by the spade are more than sufficient to defray the additional expence of cultivation. This is a resource for employing those who cannot make bread as manufacturers; and deserves well the attention of the legislature. The advantage of the spade is conspicuous with respect to war; it provides a multitude of robust men for recruiting our armies, the want of whom may be supplied by the plough, till they return in peace to their former occupation.

S K E T C H

S K E T C H III.

Progress of Men with respect to PROPERTY.

AMong the senses inherent in the nature of man, the sense of property is eminent. By this sense wild animals caught by labour or art, are perceived to belong to the hunter or fisher; they become his *property*. This sense is the foundation of *meum et tuum*, a distinction of which no human being is ignorant. In the shepherd-state, there is the same perception of property with respect to wild animals tamed for use, and also with respect to their progeny. It takes place also with respect to a field separated from the common, and cultivated by a man for bread to himself and family (a).

The sense of property is slower in its growth toward maturity than the external senses, which are perfect even in childhood; but ripens faster than the sense of congruity, of symmetry, of dignity, of grace, and other delicate senses, which scarce make any figure till we become men. Children discover a sense of property in distinguishing their own chair, and their own spoon. In them however it is faint and obscure, requiring time to bring it to perfection. The gradual progress of that sense, from its infancy among savages to its maturity among polished nations, is one of the most entertaining articles that belong to the present undertaking. But as that article makes a part of Historical

(a) See Principles of Morality and Natural Religion, p. 77. edit. 2.

law-tracts (a), nothing remains for me but a few gleanings. Man is by nature a hoarding animal, having an appetite for storing up things of use; and the sense of property is bestow'd on men, for securing to them what they thus store up. Hence it appears, that things provided by Providence for our sustenance and accommodation, were not intended to be possessed in common; and probably in the earliest ages every man separately hunted for himself and his family. But chance prevails in that occupation; and it may frequently happen, that while some get more than enough, others must go supperless to bed. Sensible of that inconvenience, it crept into practice, for hunting and fishing to be carried on in common*. We find accordingly the practice of hunting and fishing in common, even among gross savages. Those of New Holland, above mentioned, live upon small fish dug out of the sand when the sea retires. Sometimes they get plenty,

* Inequalities of chance, which are great in a few instances, vanish almost entirely when the operation is frequently reiterated during a course of time. Did every man's subsistence depend on the fruits of his own field, many would die of hunger, while others wallowed in plenty. Barter and commerce among the inhabitants of a district, lessen the hazard of famine: the commerce of corn through a large kingdom, such as France or Britain, lessens it still more: extend that commerce through Europe, through the world, and there will remain scarce a vestige of the inequalities of chance: the crop of corn may fail in one province, or in one kingdom; but that it should fail universally is beyond the varieties of chance. The same observation holds in every other matter of chance: one's gain or loss at game for a night, for a week, may be considerable; but carry on the game for a year, and so little of chance remains, that it is almost the same whether one play for a guinea or for twenty. Hence a skilful insurer never ventures much upon one bottom; but multiplies his bargains as much as possible: the more bargains he is engaged in, the greater is the probability of success.

(a) Tra& 3.

sometimes

sometimes very little; but whether successful or unsuccessful, all is broiled and eat in common. After eating they go to rest: they return to their fishing next ebb of the tide, whether it be day or night, foul or fair; for go they must, or starve. In small tribes, where patriotism is vigorous, or in a country thinly peopled in proportion to its fertility, the living in common is extremely comfortable; but in a large state where selfishness prevails, or in any state where great population requires extraordinary culture, the best method is to allow every man to shift for himself and his family: men wish to labour for themselves; and they labour more ardently for themselves than for the public. Private property became more and more sacred in the progress of arts and manufactures: to allow an artist of superior talents no profit above others, would be a sad discouragement to industry, and be scarce consistent with common justice.

The sense of property is not confined to the human species. The beavers perceive the timber they store up for food, to be their property; and the bees seem to have the same perception with respect to their winter's provision of honey. Sheep know when they are in a trespass, and run to their own pasture on the first glimpse of a man. Monkeys do the same when detected in robbing an orchard. Sheep and horned cattle have a sense of property with respect to their resting-place in a fold or inclosure, which every one guards against the incroachment of others. He must be a sceptic indeed who denies that perception to rooks: thieves there are among them as among men; but if a rook purloin a stick from another's nest, a council is held, much chattering ensues, and the *lex talionis* is applied, by demolishing the nest of the criminal. To man are furnished rude materials only: to convert these into food and cloathing requires industry; and if he had not a sense that the product of his labour belongs to himself, his industry would be extremely faint. In general,

it is pleasant to observe, that the sense of property is always given where it is useful, and never but where it is useful.

An ingenious writer, describing the inhabitants of Guiana, who continue hunters and fishers, makes an eloquent harangue upon the happiness they enjoy, in having few wants and desires, and in having very little notion of private property. “The manners of these Indians exhibit an amiable picture of primeval innocence and happiness. The ease with which their few wants are supplied, renders division of land unnecessary; nor does it afford any temptation to fraud or violence. That proneness to vice, which among civilized nations is esteemed a propensity of nature, has no existence in a country where every man enjoys in perfection his native freedom and independence, without hurting or being hurt by others. A perfect equality of rank, banishing all distinctions but of age and personal merit, promotes freedom in conversation, and firmness in action; and suggests no desires but what may be gratified with innocence. Envy and discontent cannot subsist with perfect equality; we scarce even hear of a discontented lover, as there is no difference of rank and fortune, the common obstacles that prevent fruition. Those who have been unhappily accustomed to the refinements of luxury, will scarce be able to conceive, that an Indian, with no covering but what modesty requires, with no shelter that deserves the name of a house, and with no food but of the coarsest kind painfully procured by hunting, can feel any happiness: and yet to judge from external appearance, the happiness of these people may be envied by the wealthy of the most refined nations; and justly; because their ignorance of extravagant desires, and endless pursuits that torment the great world, excludes every wish beyond the present. In a word, the inhabitants of Guiana are an example of what Socrates justly observes, that those who want the least, approach the nearest to the gods, who want
“nothing.”

"nothing." It must be acknowledged, that the innocence of savages, here painted in fine colours, is in every respect more amiable than the luxury of opulent cities, where sensuality and selfishness are ruling passions. But is our author unacquainted with a middle state between the two extremes, more suitable than either to the dignity of human nature? The appetite for property is not bestow'd upon us in vain: it has given birth to many useful arts, and to almost all the fine arts; it is still more useful in furnishing opportunity for gratifying the most dignified natural affections; for without private property, what place would there be for benevolence or charity (a)? Without private property, there would be no industry; and without industry, men would remain savages for ever.

The appetite for property, in its nature a great blessing, degenerates, I acknowledge, into a great curse when it transgresses the bounds of moderation. Before money was introduced, the appetite seldom was immoderate, because plain necessities were its only objects. But money is a species of property, of such extensive use as greatly to inflame the appetite. Money prompts men to be industrious; and the beautiful productions of industry and art, rousing the imagination, excite a violent desire of fine houses, ornamented gardens, and of every thing gay and splendid. Habitual wants multiply: luxury and sensuality gain ground: the appetite for property becomes headstrong, and must be gratified even at the expence of justice and honour. Examples are without number of this progress; and yet the following history deserves to be kept in memory, as a striking and lamentable illustration. Hispaniola was that part of America which Columbus first discovered *anno* 1497. He landed upon the territory of

(a) Historical law-trade, tract 35

Guacanaric, one of the principal Cacics of the island. That prince, who had nothing barbarous in his manners, received his guests with cordiality; and encouraged his people to vie with one another in obliging them. To gratify the Spanish appetite for gold, they parted freely with their richest ornaments; and in return, were satisfied with glass beads, and such baubles. The Admiral's ship having been tossed against the rocks in a hurricane, Guacanaric was not wanting to his friend on that occasion: he convened a number of men to assist in unloading the ship; and attended himself till the cargo was safely lodged in a magazine. The Admiral having occasion to return to Spain, left a part of his crew behind; who, forgetting the lessons of moderation he had taught them, turned licentious. The remonstrances of Guacanaric were in vain: they seized upon the gold and wives of the Indians; and in general treated them with great cruelty. Such enormities did not long pass unresented: the rapacious Spaniards, after much bloodshed, were shut up in their fort, and reduced to extremity. Unhappily a reinforcement arrived from Spain: a long and bloody war ensued, which did not end till the islanders were wholly brought under. Of this island, about 200 leagues in length and between sixty and eighty in breadth, a Spanish historian bears witness, that the inhabitants amounted to a million when Columbus landed *. The Spaniards, relentless in their cruelty, forc'd these poor people to abandon the culture of their fields, and to retire to the woods and mountains. Hunted like wild beasts even in these retreats, they fled from mountain to mountain, till hunger and fatigue, which destroy'd more than the sword, forc'd them to deliver themselves up to their implacable conquerors.

* As little corn was at that time produced in the island, and less of animal food, there is reason to suspect, that the numbers are exaggerated. But whether a million, or a half of that number, the moral is the same.

There

There remained at that time but 60,000, who were divided among the Spaniards as slaves: Excessive fatigue in the mines, and want of even the common necessities of life, reduced them in five years to 14,000. Considering them merely as beasts of burden, they would have yielded more profit had they been treated with less inhumanity. Avarice frequently counteracts its own end: by grasping too much, it loses all. The Emperor Charles resolved to apply some effectual remedy; but being interrupted for some time by various avocations, he got intelligence that the poor Indians were totally extirpated. And they were so in reality, a handful excepted, who lay hid in the mountains, and subsisted as by a miracle in the midst of their enemies. That handful were discovered many years after by some hunters; who treated them with humanity, regretting perhaps the barbarity of their forefathers. The poor Indians, docile and submissive, embraced the Christian religion, and assumed by degrees the manners and customs of their masters. They still exist, and live by hunting and fishing.

Affection for property! Janus double-fac'd, productive of many blessings, but degenerating often to be a curse. In thy right hand, Industry, a cornucopia of plenty: in thy left, Avarice, a Pandora's box of deadly poison.

I. 2

SKETCH

As little corn was at that time produced in the island, and less of animal food, there is reason to suspect, that the numbers are exaggerated. But whether a million, or a half of that number, the moral is the same.

There

S K E T C H IV.

Origin and Progress of COMMERCE.

THE few wants of men in the first stage of society, are supplied by barter or permutation in its rudest form. In barter, the rational consideration is, what is wanted by the one, and what can be spared by the other. But savages are not always so clear-sighted: a savage who wants a knife will give for it any thing that is less useful to him at present; without considering either the present wants of the person he is dealing with, or his own future wants. An inhabitant of Guiana will for a fish-hook give more at one time, than at another he will give for a hatchet, or for a gun. Kempfer reports, that an inhabitant of Puli Timor, an island adjacent to Malacca, will, for a bit of coarse linen not worth three halfpence, give provisions worth three or four shillings. But people improve by degrees, attending to what is wanted and to what can be spared on both sides; and in that lesson, the American savages in our neighbourhood are not a little expert.

Barter or permutation, in its original form, proved miserably deficient, when men and their wants multiplied. That sort of commerce cannot be carried on at a distance; and even among neighbours, it does not always happen, that the one can spare what the other wants. Barter is somewhat enlarged by covenants: a bushel of wheat is delivered to me, upon my promising an equivalent at a future time. But what if I have nothing that

my

my neighbour may have occasion for? or what if my promise be not relied on? Thus barter, even with the aid of covenants, proves still insufficient. The numberless wants of men cannot readily be supplied without some commodity in general estimation, that will be gladly accepted in exchange for every other article of commerce. That commodity ought not to be bulky, nor be expensive in keeping, nor be consumable by time. Gold and silver are metals which possess these properties in an eminent degree. They are at the same time perfectly homogeneous in whatever country produced: two masses of pure gold or of pure silver are always equal in value, provided they be of the same weight. These metals are also divisible into small parts, convenient to be given for goods of small value.

Gold and silver, when first introduced into commerce, were probably bartered, like other commodities, by bulk merely. Rock-salt in Ethiopia, white as snow and hard as stone, is to this day bartered in that manner with other goods. It is dug out of the mountain Lafta, formed into plates of a foot long, and three inches broad and thick; and a portion is broke off equivalent in value to the thing wanted. But more nicety came to be introduced into the commerce of gold and silver: instead of being given loosely by bulk, every portion was weighed in scales: and this method of barter is practised in China, in Ethiopia, and in many other countries. Even weight was at length discovered to be an imperfect standard. Ethiopian salt may be proof against adulteration; but weight is no security against mixing gold and silver with base metals. To prevent that fraud, pieces of gold and silver are impressed with a public stamp, vouching both the purity and quantity; and such pieces are termed *coin*. This was a notable improvement in commerce; and, like other improvements, was probably at first thought the utmost stretch of human invention. It was not foreseen, that these metals wear by much handling in the

the course of circulation; and consequently, that in time the public stamp is reduced to be a voucher of the purity only, not of the quantity. Hence proceed manifold inconveniences; for which no other remedy occurs, but to restore the former method of weighing, trusting to the stamp for the purity only. This proves an embarrassment in commerce; but it will facilitate paper-money, which is free of that embarrassment.

When gold or silver in bullion is exchanged with other commodities, such commerce passes under the common name of *barter* or *permutation*: when current coin is exchanged, such commerce is termed *buying* and *selling*; and the money exchanged is termed *the price of the goods*.

As commerce cannot be carried on to any extent without a standard for comparing goods of different kinds, and as every commercial country is possessed of such a standard, it seems difficult to say by what means the standard has been established. It is plainly not founded on nature; for the different kinds of goods have naturally no common measure by which they can be valued: two quarters of wheat can be compared with twenty; but what rule have we to compare wheat with broad cloth, or either of them with gold, or gold even with silver or copper? Several ingenious writers have endeavoured to account for the comparative value of commodities, by reducing them all to the labour employ'd in raising food; which labour is said to be a standard for measuring the value of all other labour, and consequently of all things produced by labour. "If, for example, a bushel of wheat and an ounce of silver be produced by the same quantity of labour, will they not be equal in value?" This standard is imperfect in many respects. I observe, first, that to give it a rational appearance, there is a necessity to maintain, contrary to fact, that all materials on which labour is employ'd are of equal value. It requires as much labour to make a brass candlestick as one of silver,

silver, tho' far from being of the same value. A bushel of wheat may sometimes equal in value an ounce of silver; but an ounce of gold does not always require more labour than a bushel of wheat; and yet they differ widely in value. The value of labour, it is true, enters into the value of every thing produced by it; but is far from making the whole value. If an ounce of silver were of no greater value than the labour of procuring it, that ounce would go for payment of the labour, and nothing be left to the proprietor of the mine: such a doctrine will not relish with the King of Spain; and as little with the Kings of Golconda and Portugal, proprietors of diamond mines. Secondly, The standard under review supposes every sort of labour to be of equal value, which however will not be maintained. An useful art in great request, may not be generally known: the few who are skilful may justly demand more for their labour than the common rate. An expert husbandman bestows no more labour in raising a hundred bushels of wheat, than his ignorant neighbour in raising fifty: if labour be the only standard, the two crops ought to afford the same price. Was not Raphaël intitled to a higher price for one of his fine tablatures, than a dunce is for a tavern-sign, supposing the labour to have been equal? Lastly, As this standard is applicable to things only that require labour, what rule is to be followed with respect to natural fruits, and other things that require no labour?

Laying aside then this attempt to fix a standard, it occurs to me, that the value of a commodity depends chiefly, tho' not solely, on the demand. Quantity beyond the demand renders even necessities of no value; of which water is an instance. It may be held accordingly as a general rule, That the value of goods in commerce depends on a demand beyond what their quantity can satisfy; and rises in proportion to the excess of the demand above the quantity. Even water becomes valuable in countries where
the

the demand exceeds the quantity: in arid regions, springs of water are highly valued; and in old times were frequently the occasion of broils and bloodshed. Comparing next different commodities with respect to value, that commodity of which the excess of the demand above the quantity is the greater, will be of the greater value. Were utility or intrinsic value only to be considered, a pound of iron would be worth ten pounds of gold; but as the excess of the demand for gold above its quantity is much greater than that of iron, the latter is of less value in the market. A pound of opium or of Jesuit's bark is, for its salutary effects, more valuable than gold; and yet, for the reason given, a pound of gold will purchase many pounds of these drugs. Thus, in general, the excess of the demand above the quantity is the standard that chiefly fixes the mercantile value of commodities*.

The causes that make a demand, seem not so easily ascertained. One thing is evident, that the demand for necessities in any country, must depend on the number of its inhabitants. This rule holds not so strictly in articles of convenience; because some people are more greedy of conveniencies than others. As to articles of taste and luxury, the demand appears so arbitrary as scarce to be reducible to any rule. A taste for beauty is general; but so different in different persons, as to make the demand extremely variable: the faint representation of any plant in an agate, is valued by some for its rarity; but the demand is far from being universal. Savages are despised for being fond of glass beads; but were

* In a voyage to Arabia Felix, ann. 1708, by a French ship, the King of the territory where the crew landed, gave them an ox weighing a thousand or twelve hundred pounds for a fusce, and three score pound-weight of rice for twenty-eight ounces of gun-powder. The goods bartered were estimated according to the wants of each party, or, in other words, according to the demand above the quantity.

such toys equally rare among us, they would be coveted by many: a copper coin of the Emperor Otho is of no intrinsic value; and yet, for its rarity, would draw a great price.

The value of gold and silver in commerce, like that of other commodities, was at first, we may believe, both arbitrary and fluctuating; and, like other commodities, they found in time their value in the market. With respect to value, however, there is a great difference between money and other commodities. Goods that are expensive in keeping, such as cattle, or that are impaired by time, such as corn, will always be first offered in exchange for what is wanted; and when such goods are offered to sale, the vender must be contented with the current price: in making the bargain the purchaser has the advantage; for he suffers not by reserving his money to a better market. And thus commodities are brought down by money to the lowest value that can afford any profit. At the same time, gold and silver sooner find their value than other commodities. The value of the latter is regulated both by the quantity and by the demand; the value of the former is regulated by the quantity only, the demand being unbounded: and even with respect to quantity, these precious metals are less variable than other commodities.

Gold and silver being thus sooner fixed in their value than other commodities, become a standard for valuing every other commodity, and consequently for comparative values. A bushel of wheat, for example, being valued at five shillings, a yard of broad cloth at fifteen, their comparative values are as one to three.

A standard of values is essential to commerce; and therefore where gold and silver are unknown, other standards are established by practice. The only standard among the savages of North America is the skin of a beaver. Ten of these are given for a gun, two for a pound of gun-powder, one for four pounds of

lead, one for six knives, one for a hatchet, six for a coat of wool-
len cloth, five for a petticoat, and one for a pound of tobacco.
Some nations in Africa employ shells, termed *couries*, for a stand-
ard.

As my chief view in this sketch is, to examine how far indu-
stry and commerce are affected by the quantity of circulating
coin, I premise, in that view, the following plain propositions.
Supposing, first, the quantity of money in circulation, and the
quantity of goods in the market, to continue the same, the price
will rise and fall with the demand. For when more goods are de-
manded than the market affords, those who offer the highest price
will be preferred: as, on the other hand, when the goods brought
to market exceed the demand, the venders have no resource but
to entice purchasers by a low price. The price of fish, flesh,
butter, and cheese, is much higher than formerly; for these be-
ing now the daily food even of the lowest people, the demand for
them is greatly increased.

Supposing now a fluctuation in the quantity of goods only, the
price falls as the quantity increases, and rises as the quantity de-
creases. The farmer whose quantity of corn is doubled by a
favourable season, must sell at half the usual price; because the
purchaser, who sees a superfluity, will pay no more for it. The
contrary happens upon a scanty crop: those who want corn must
starve, or give the market-price, however high. The manufac-
tures of wool, flax, and metals, are much cheaper than former-
ly; for tho' the demand has increased, yet by skill and industry
the quantities produced have increased in a greater proportion.
More pot-herbs are consumed than formerly; and yet by skilful
culture the quantity is so much greater in proportion, as to have
lowered the price to less than one half of what it was eighty years
ago.

It

It is easy to combine the quantity and demand, supposing a fluctuation in both. Where the quantity exceeds the usual demand, more people will be tempted to purchase by the low price; and where the demand rises considerably above the quantity, the price will rise in proportion. In mathematical language, these propositions may be thus expressed, that the price is *directly* as the demand, and *inversely* as the quantity.

A variation in the quantity of circulating coin is the most intricate circumstance; because it never happens without making a variation in the demand for goods, and frequently in the quantity. I take the liberty however to suppose, that there is no variation but in the quantity of circulating coin; for tho' that cannot happen in reality, yet the result of the supposition will throw light upon what really happens: the subject is involved, and I wish to make it plain. I put a simple case, that the half of our current coin is at once swept away by some extraordinary accident. This at first will embarrass our internal commerce, as the vender will insist for the usual price, which now cannot be afforded. But the error of such demand will soon be discovered; and the price of commodities, after some fluctuation, will settle at the one half of what it was formerly. At the same time, there is here no downfall in the value of commodities, which cannot happen while the quantity and demand continue unvaried. The purchasing for a sixpence what formerly cost a shilling, makes no alteration in the value of the things purchased; because a sixpence is equal in value to what a shilling was formerly. In a word, when money is scarce, it must bear a high value: it must in particular go far in the purchase of goods; which we express by saying, that goods are cheap. — Put next the case, that by some accident our specie is instantly doubled. Upon supposition that the quantity and demand continue unvaried, the result must be, not instantaneous indeed, to double the price of commodities. Upon the former

supposition, a fixpence is in effect advanced to be a shilling: upon the present supposition, a shilling has in effect sunk down to a fixpence. And here again it ought to be observed, that tho' the price is augmented, there is no real alteration in the value of commodities. A bullock that, some years ago, could have been purchased for ten pounds, will at present yield fifteen. The vulgar ignorantly think, that the value of horned cattle has risen in that proportion. The advanced price may, in some degree, be occasioned by a greater consumption; but it is chiefly occasioned by a greater quantity of money in circulation *.

Combining all the circumstances, the result is, that if the quantity of goods and of money continue the same, the price will be in proportion to the demand. If the demand and quantity of goods continue the same, the price will be in proportion to the quantity of money. And if the demand and quantity of money continue the same, the price will fall as the quantity increases, and rise as the quantity diminishes.

These speculative notions will, I hope, enable us with accuracy to examine, how industry and commerce are affected by variations in the quantity of circulating coin. It is evident, that arts and manufactures cannot be carried on to any extent, without coin.

* It is commonly thought, that the rate of interest depends on the quantity of circulating coin; that interest will be high when money is scarce, and low when money abounds. But whatever be the cause of high or low interest, I am certain that the quantity of circulating coin can have no influence. Supposing, as above, the half of our money to be withdrawn, a hundred pounds lent ought still to afford but five pounds as interest; because if the principal be doubled in value, so is also the interest. If, on the other hand, the quantity of our money be doubled, the five pounds of interest will continue to bear the same proportion to the principal as formerly.

Hands

Hands totally employ'd in any art or manufacture require wages daily or weekly, because they must go to market for every necessary of life. The clothier, the tailor, the shoemaker, the gardener, the farmer, must employ servants to prepare their goods for the market, to whom, for that reason, wages ought to be regularly paid. In a word, commerce among an endless number of individuals who depend on each other even for necessities, would be altogether inextricable without a quantity of circulating coin. Money may be justly conceived to be the oil, that lubricates all the springs and wheels of a great machine, and preserves it in motion *. Supposing us now to be provided with no more of that precious oil than is barely sufficient for the easy motion of our industry and manufactures, a diminution of the necessary quantity must cramp all of them. Our industry and manufactures must decay; and if we do not confine the expence of living to our present circumstances, which seldom happens, the balance of trade with foreign nations will turn against us, and leave us no resource for making the balance equal, but to export our gold and silver. And when we are drained of these metals, farewell to arts and manufactures. We shall be reduced to the condition of savages, which is, that each individual depends entirely on his own labour for procuring every necessary of life. The consequences of a favourable balance are at first directly opposite: but at the long-run come out to be the same: they are sweet in the mouth, but bitter in the stomach. A brisk influx of

money spreads. But whatever be the cause of high or low interest, I am certain that the quantity of circulating coin can have no influence. Supposing, as above, * Money cannot be justly said to be deficient where there is sufficiency to purchase every commodity, including labour, that is wanted. Any greater quantity is hurtful to commerce, as will be seen afterward. But to be forc'd to contract debt even when one deals prudently and profitably, and consequently to be subjected to legal execution, is a proof, by no means ambiguous, of scarcity of money; which till of late was remarkably the case in Scotland.

[riches

riches by a favourable balance, rouses our activity. Plenty of money elevates our spirits, and inspires an appetite for pleasure: we indulge a taste for show and embellishment; become hospitable, and refine upon the arts of luxury. Plenty of money is a prevailing motive even with the most sedate, to exert themselves in building, in husbandry, in manufactures, and in other solid improvements. Such articles require both hands and materials, the prices of which are raised by the additional demand. The labourer again whose wages are thus raised, is not now satisfied with mere necessities; but insists for conveniencies, the price of which also is raised by the new demand. In short, increase of money raises the price of every commodity; partly from the greater quantity of money, and partly from the additional demand for supplying artificial wants. Hitherto a delightful view of prosperous commerce: but behold the remote consequences. High wages will undoubtedly promote at first the spirit of industry, and double the quantity of labour: but the utmost exertion of labour is limited within certain bounds; and consequently a perpetual influx of gold and silver will not for ever be attended with a proportional quantity of work: The price of labour will rise in proportion to the quantity of money; but the produce will not rise in the same proportion; and for that reason our manufactures will be dearer than formerly. Hence a dismal scene. The high price at home of our manufactures will exclude us from foreign markets; for if the merchant cannot draw there for his goods what he paid at home, with some profit, he must abandon foreign commerce altogether. And what is still more dismal, we shall be deprived even of our own markets; for in spite of the utmost vigilance, foreign commodities, cheaper than our own, will be poured in upon us. The last scene is to be deprived of our gold and silver, and reduced to the same miserable state as if the balance had been against us from the beginning.

However

However certain it may appear, that an augmentation in the quantity of money must raise the price of labour and of manufactures, yet there is a fact that seems to contradict the proposition, which is, that in no other country are labour and manufactures so cheap as in the two peninsulas on the right and left of the Ganges, tho' in no other country is there such plenty of money. To account for this singular fact, political writers say, that money is there amassed by the nabobs, and withdrawn from circulation. This is not satisfactory: the chief exportation from these peninsulas are their manufactures, the price of which comes first to the merchant and manufacturer; and how can that happen without raising the price of labour? Rice, it is true, is the food of their labouring poor; and an acre of rice yields more food than five acres of wheat: but the cheapness of necessaries, tho' it hath a considerable influence in keeping down the price of labour, cannot have an effect so extraordinary as to keep it constantly down, in opposition to an overflowing current of money. The populousness of these two countries is a circumstance that has been totally overlooked. Every traveller is amazed how such swarms of people can find bread, however fertile the soil may be. Let us examine that circumstance. One thing is evident, that were the people fully employ'd, there would not be a demand for the tenth part of their manufactures. Here then is a country where hand-labour is a drug for want of employment. The people at the same time, sober and industrious, are glad to be employ'd at any rate; and whatever pittance is gained by labour makes always some addition. Hence it is, that in these peninsulas, superfluity of hands overbalancing both the quantity of money and the demand for their manufactures, serves to keep the price extremely low.

What is now said discovers an error in the proposition above laid down. It holds undoubtedly in Europe, and in every country where there is work for all the people, that an augmentation

tion

tion in the circulating coin raises the price of labour and of manufactures: but such augmentation has no sensible effect in a country where there is a superfluity of hands, who are always disposed to work when they find employment.

From these premises it will be evident, that unless there be a superfluity of hands, manufactures can never flourish in a country abounding with mines of gold and silver. This in effect is the case of Spain: a constant influx of these metals, raising the price of labour and of manufactures, has deprived the Spaniards of foreign markets, and also of their own: they are reduced to purchase from strangers even the necessaries of life. What a dismal condition will they be reduced to when their mines come to be exhausted!

To illustrate this observation, which indeed is of great importance, I enter more minutely into the condition of Spain. The rough materials of silk, wool, and iron, are produced there more perfect than in any other country; and yet flourishing manufactures of these would be ruinous to it in its present state. Let us only suppose, that Spain itself could furnish all the commodities that are demanded in its American territories; what would be the consequence? The gold and silver produced by that trade would center and circulate in Spain: money would become a drug: labour and manufactures would rise to a high price; and every necessary of life, not excepting manufactures of silk, wool, and iron, would be smuggled into Spain, the high price there being sufficient to overbalance every risk: Spain would be left without industry, and without people. Spain was actually in the flourishing state here supposed when America was discovered: its gold and silver mines enflamed the disease; and consequently was the greatest misfortune that ever befel that once potent kingdom. The exportation of our silver coin to the East Indies, so loudly exclaim'd against by shallow politicians, is to us, on the contrary, a most substantial

substantial benefit: it keeps up the value of silver, and consequently lessens the value of labour and of goods, which enables us to maintain our place in foreign markets. Were there no drain for our silver, its quantity in our continent would sink its value so much as to render the American mines unprofitable. Notwithstanding the great flow of money to the East Indies, many mines in the West Indies are given up, because they afford not the expence of working; and were the value of silver in Europe brought much lower, the whole silver mines in the West Indies would be necessarily abandoned. Thus our East-India commerce, which is thought ruinous by many, because it is a drain to much of our silver, is for that very reason profitable to all. The Spaniards profit by importing it into Europe; and other nations profit, by receiving it for their manufactures.

How ignorantly do people struggle against the necessary connection of causes and effects! If money do not overflow, a commerce in which the imports exceed in value the exports, will soon drain a nation of its money, and put an end to industry. Commercial nations for that reason struggle hard for a favourable balance of trade; and they fondly imagine that it cannot be too favourable. If advantageous to them, it must be disadvantageous to those they deal with; which proves equally ruinous to both. They foresee indeed, but without concern, immediate ruin to those they deal with; but they have no inclination to foresee, that ultimately it will prove equally ruinous to themselves. It appears the intention of Providence, that all nations should benefit by commerce as by sunshine; and it is so ordered, that an unequal balance is prejudicial to the gainers as well as to the losers; the latter are immediate sufferers; but not less so ultimately are the former. This is one remarkable instance, among many, of providential wisdom in conducting human affairs, independent of the will of man, and frequently against his will. An ambitious nation,

tion, placed advantageously for trade, would willingly engross all to themselves, and reduce their neighbours to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. But an invincible bar is opposed to such avarice, making an overgrown commerce the means of its own destruction. The commercial balance held by the hand of Providence, is never permitted to preponderate much to one side; and every nation partakes, or may partake, of all the comforts of life. Engrossing is bad policy; and men are prompted, both by interest and duty, to second the plan of Providence, and to preserve, as near as possible, equality in the balance of trade.

Upon these principles, a wise people, having acquired a stock of money sufficient for an extensive commerce, will tremble at a balance too advantageous: they will rest satisfied with an equal balance, which is the golden mean. A disadvantageous balance may always be prevented by industry and frugality: but by what means is a balance too favourable to be guarded against? With respect to that question, it is not the quantity singly of gold and silver in a country that raises the price of labour and manufactures, but the quantity in circulation; and may not the circulating quantity be regulated by the state, permitting no coinage but what is beneficial to its manufactures? Let the registers of foreign mints be carefully watched, in order that our current coin may not exceed that of our industrious neighbours. There will always be a demand for the surplus of our bullion, either to be exported as a commodity, or to be purchased at home for plate: which cannot be too much encouraged, being ready at every crisis to be coined for public service. The senate of Genoa has wisely burdened porcelain with a heavy tax, being a foreign luxury; but it has not less wisely left gold and silver plate free; while we most unwisely have loaded it with a duty.

The accumulating of money in the public treasury, anciently the practice of every prudent monarch, prevents superfluity. Lies there

there any good objection against that practice, in a trading nation where gold and silver flow in with impetuosity? A great sum lock'd up by a frugal king, Henry VII. of England for example, lessens the quantity of money in circulation: profusion in a successor, which was the case of Henry VIII. is a spur to industry, similar to the influx of gold and silver from the new world. The canton of Bern, by locking up money in its treasury, possesses the miraculous art of reconciling immense wealth with frugality and cheap labour. A climate not kindly, and a soil not naturally fertile, enured the inhabitants to temperance and to virtue. Patriotism is their ruling passion: they consider themselves as children of the republic; are fond of serving their mother; and hold themselves sufficiently recompensed by the privilege of serving her; by which means the public revenue greatly exceeds the expence of government. They carefully lock up the surplus for purchasing land when a proper opportunity offers; which is a shining proof of their disinterestedness as well as of their wisdom. By that politic measure, much more than by war, the canton of Bern, from a very slender origin, is now far superior to any of the other cantons in extent of territory. But in what other part of the globe are there to be found ministers of state, moderate and disinterested like the citizens of Bern! In the hands of a rapacious ministry, the greatest treasure would not be long-lived: under the management of a British ministry, it would vanish in the twinkling of an eye; and do more mischief by augmenting our money in circulation above what is salutary, than formerly it did good by confining it within moderate bounds. But against such a measure there lies an objection still more weighty than its being an ineffectual remedy: in the hands of an ambitious prince it would prove dangerous to liberty.

If the foregoing measures be not relished, I can discover no other means for preserving our station in foreign markets, but a

bounty on exportation. The sum would be great: but the preserving our industry and manufactures, and the preventing an influx of foreign manufactures, are conspicuous advantages that cannot be purchased too dear. At the same time, a bounty on exportation would not be an unsupportable load: on the contrary, superfluity of wealth, procured by a balance constantly favourable, would make the load abundantly easy. A proper bounty would balance the growing price of labour and materials at home, and keep open the foreign market. By neglecting that salutary measure, the Dutch have lost all their manufactures, a neglect that has greatly benefited both England and France. The Dutch indeed act prudently in withholding that benefit as much as possible from their powerful neighbours: to prevent purchasing from them, they consume the manufactures of India.

The manufactures of Spain, once extensive, have been extirpated, partly by their mines of gold and silver. Authors ascribe to the same cause the decline of their agriculture; but erroneously: on the contrary, superfluity of gold and silver is favourable to agriculture, by raising the price of its productions. It raises also, it is true, the price of labour; but that additional expence is far from balancing the profit made by high prices of whatever is raised out of the ground. Too much wealth indeed is apt to make the farmer press into a higher rank: but it is the landlord's fault if that evil be not prevented by a proper heightening of the rent, which will always confine the farmer within his own sphere.

As gold and silver are essential to commerce, foreign and domestic, several commercial nations, fond of these precious metals, have endeavoured most absurdly to bar the exportation by penal laws; forgetting that gold and silver will never be exported while the balance of trade is in their favour, and that they must necessarily be exported when the balance is against them. Neither do they consider, that if a people continue industrious, they cannot be

be long afflicted with an unfavourable balance; for the value of money, rising in proportion to its scarcity, will lower the price of their manufactures, and promote exportation: the balance will turn in their favour; and money will flow in, till by plenty its value be reduced to a par with that of neighbouring nations.

It is an important question, Whether a bank be upon the whole beneficial or hurtful to commerce. It is undoubtedly a spur to industry, like a new influx of money: but then, like such influx, it raises the price of labour and of manufactures. Weighing these two facts in a just balance, the result seems to be, that in a country where money is scarce, a bank properly constituted is a great blessing, as it in effect multiplies the specie, and promotes industry and manufactures; but that in a country which possesses money sufficient for an extensive trade, the only bank that will not hurt foreign commerce, is what is erected for supplying the merchant with ready money by discounting bills. At the same time, much caution and circumspection is necessary with respect to banks of both kinds. A bank erected for discounting bills, ought to be confined to bills really granted in the course of commerce; and ought to avoid, as much as possible, the being imposed on by fictitious bills drawn merely in order to procure a loan of money. And with respect to a bank purposely erected for lending money, there is great danger of extending credit too far, not only with respect to the bank itself and to its numerous debtors, but with respect to the country in general, by raising the price of labour and of manufactures, which is the never-failing result of too great plenty of money, whether coin or paper.

The different effects of plenty and scarcity of money, have not escaped that penetrating genius, the sovereign of Prussia. Money is not so plentiful in his dominions as to make it necessary to withdraw a quantity by heaping up treasure. He indeed always retains in his treasury six or seven millions Sterling for answering
unforeseen

unforeseen demands: but being sensible that the withdrawing from circulation any larger sum would be prejudicial to commerce, every farthing saved from the necessary expence of government, is laid out upon buildings, upon operas, upon any thing rather than cramp circulation. In that kingdom, a bank established for lending money would promote industry and manufactures.

SKETCH

Some effects must be nearly coeval with the human race; for food, clothing, and habitation, even in their original simplicity, require some art. Many other arts are of such antiquity as to place the inventors beyond the reach of tradition. Several have gradually crept into existence, without an inventor. The busy mind however, accustomed to a beginning in things, cannot rest till it find or imagine a beginning to every art. Bacon is said to have invented wine; and Scythians the mixing water with wine. The bow and arrow are ascribed by tradition to Scythos, son of Jupiter, the weapon all the world over. Spinning is so useful, that it must be honoured with some illustrious inventor: it was ascribed by the Egyptians to their goddess Isis; by the Greeks to Minerva; by the Persians to Manna Ella; wife to their first sovereign Mango Capac; and by the Chinese to the wife of their Emperor Yao. Mark here by the way a conclusion

unforeseen demands: but being sensible that the withdrawing from circulation any larger sum would be prejudicial to commerce, every farthing saved from the necessary expence of government, is laid out upon publick buildings, upon any thing rather than cramp circulation. In that kingdom a bank established for lending money would promote industry and manufactures.

Origin and Progress of ARTS.

SECTION I.

USEFUL ARTS.

Some useful arts must be nearly coeval with the human race; for food, cloathing, and habitation, even in their original simplicity, require some art. Many other arts are of such antiquity as to place the inventors beyond the reach of tradition. Several have gradually crept into existence, without an inventor. The busy mind however, accustomed to a beginning in things, cannot rest till it find or imagine a beginning to every art. Bacchus is said to have invented wine; and Staphylus, the mixing water with wine. The bow and arrow are ascribed by tradition to Scythos, son of Jupiter, tho' a weapon all the world over. Spinning is so useful, that it must be honoured with some illustrious inventor: it was ascribed by the Egyptians to their goddess Isis; by the Greeks to Minerva; by the Peruvians to Mama Ella, wife to their first sovereign Mango Capac; and by the Chinese to the wife of their Emperor Yao. Mark here by the way a connection

nection of ideas: spinning is a female occupation, and it must have had a female inventor*.

In the hunter-state, men are wholly occupied in procuring food, cloathing, habitation, and other necessities; and have no time nor zeal for studying conveniencies. The ease of the shepherd-state affords both time and inclination for useful arts; which are greatly promoted by numbers who are relieved by agriculture from bodily labour: the soil, by gradual improvements in husbandry, affords plenty with less labour than at first; and the surplus hands are employ'd, first, in useful arts, and, next, in those of amusement. Arts accordingly make the quickest progress in a fertile soil, which produces plenty with little labour. Arts flourished early in Egypt and Chaldea, countries extremely fertile.

When men, who originally lived in caves like some wild animals, began to think of a more commodious habitation, their first houses were extremely simple; witness the houses of the Canadian savages, which continue so to this day. Their houses, says Charlevoix, are built with less art, neatness, and solidity, than those of the beavers; having neither chimneys nor windows: a hole only is left in the roof, for admitting light, and emitting smoke. That hole must be stopped when it rains or snows; and of course the fire is put out, that the inhabitants may not be blinded with smoke. To have passed so many ages in that man-

* The Illinois are industrious above all their American neighbours. Their women are neat-handed: they spin the wool of their horned cattle, which is as fine as that of English sheep. The stuffs made of it are dyed black, yellow, or red, and cut into garments sewed with roe-buck sinews. After drying these sinews in the sun, and beating them, they draw out threads as white and fine as any that are made of flax, but much tougher.

ner,

ner, without thinking of any improvement, shows how greatly men are influenced by custom. The blacks of Jamaica are still more rude in their buildings: their huts are erected without even a hole in the roof; and accordingly at home they breathe nothing but smoke.

Revenge early produced hostile weapons. The club and the dart are obvious inventions: not so the bow and arrow; and for that reason it is not easy to say how that weapon came to be universal. As iron is seldom found in a mine like other metals, it was a late discovery: at the siege of Troy, spears, darts, and arrows, were headed with brass. Menestheus, who succeeded Theseus in the kingdom of Athens, and led fifty ships to the siege of Troy, was reputed the first who marshalled an army in battle-array. Instruments of defence are made necessary by those of offence. Trunks of trees, interlaced with branches, and supported with earth, made the first fortifications; to which succeeded a wall finished with a parapet for shooting arrows at besiegers. As a parapet covers but half of the body, holes were left in the wall from space to space, no larger than to give passage to an arrow. Besiegers had no remedy but to beat down the wall: a battering ram was first used by Pericles the Athenian, and perfected by the Carthaginians at the siege of Gades. To oppose that formidable machine, the wall was built with advanced parapets for throwing stones and fire upon the enemy, which kept him at a distance. A wooden-booth upon wheels, and pushed close to the wall, secured the men who wrought the battering ram. This invention was rendered ineffectual, by surrounding the wall with a deep and broad ditch. Besiegers were reduced to the necessity of inventing engines for throwing stones and javelins upon those who occupied the advanced parapets, in order to give opportunity for filling up the ditch; and ancient histories expatiate upon the powerful operation of the catapulta and balista. These engines suggest-

ed a new invention for defence: instead of a circular wall, it was built with salient angles, like the teeth of a saw, in order that one part might flank another. That form of a wall was afterward improved, by raising round towers upon the salient angles; and the towers were improved by making them square. The ancients had no occasion for any form more complete, being sufficient for defending against all the missile weapons at that time known. The invention of cannon required a variation in military architecture. The first cannons were made of iron bars, forming a concave cylinder, united by rings of copper. The first cannonballs were of stone, which required a very large aperture. A cannon was reduced to a smaller size, by using iron for balls instead of stone; and that destructive engine was perfected by making it of cast metal. To resist its force, bastions were invented, horn-works, crown-works, half-moons, &c. &c.; and military architecture became a system, governed by fundamental principles and general rules. But all in vain: it has indeed produced fortifications that have made sieges horridly bloody; but artillery at the same time has been carried to such perfection, and the art of attack so improved, that, according to the general opinion, no fortification can be rendered impregnable. The only impregnable defence, is good neighbourhood among weak princes, ready to unite whenever one of them is attacked with superior force. And nothing tends more effectually to promote such union, than constant experience that fortifications ought not to be relied on.

With respect to naval architecture, the first vessels were beams joined together, and covered with planks, pushed along with long poles in shallow water, and drawn by animals in deep water. To these succeeded trunks of trees cut hollow, termed by the Greeks *monoxyles*. The next were planks joined together in form of a monoxyle. The thought of imitating a fish advanced naval architecture. A prow was constructed in imitation of the head, a stern with

with a moveable helm, in imitation of the tail, and oars in imitation of the fins. Sails were at last added; which invention was so early that the contriver is unknown. Before the year 1545, ships of war in England had no port-holes for guns, as at present: they had only a few cannon placed on the upper deck.

When Homer composed his poems, at least during the Trojan war, the Greeks had not acquired the art of gelding cattle; they eat the flesh of bulls and of rams. Kings and princes killed and cooked their victuals: spoons, forks, table-cloths, napkins, were unknown. They sed sitting, the custom of reclining upon beds being afterward copied from Asia; and, like other savages, they were great eaters. At the time mentioned, they had not chimneys, nor candles, nor lamps. Torches are frequently mentioned by Homer, but lamps never: a vase was placed upon a tripod, in which was burnt dry wood for giving light. Locks and keys were not common at that time. Bundles were secured with ropes intricately combined (a); and hence the famous Gordian knot. Shoes and stockings were not early known among them, nor buttons, nor saddles, nor stirrups. Plutarch reports, that Gracchus caused stones to be erected along the high-ways leading from Rome, for the convenience of mounting a horse; for at that time stirrups were unknown, tho' an obvious invention. Linen for shirts was not used in Rome for many years after the government became despotic. Even so late as the eighth century, it was not common in Europe.

Thales, one of the seven wise men of Greece, about six hundred years before Christ, invented the following method for measuring the height of an Egyptian pyramid. He watched the progress of the sun, till his body and its shadow were of the same length; and

(a) *Odysssey*, b. 8. l. 483. Pope's translation.

at that instant measured the shadow of the pyramid, which consequently gave its height. Amasis King of Egypt, present at the operation, thought it a wonderful effort of genius; and the Greeks admired it highly. Geometry must have been in its very cradle at that time. Anaximander, some ages before Christ, made the first map of the earth, so far as then known. About the end of the thirteenth century, spectacles for assisting the sight were invented by Alexander Spina, a monk of Pisa. So useful an invention cannot be too much extolled. At a period of life when the judgement is in maturity, and reading is of great benefit, the eyes begin to grow dim. One cannot help pitying the condition of bookish men before that invention; many of whom must have had their sight greatly impaired, while their appetite for reading was in vigour.

As the origin and progress of writing make a capital article in the present sketch, they must not be overlooked. To write, or, in other words, to exhibit thoughts to the eye, was early attempted in Egypt by hieroglyphics. But these were not confined to Egypt: figures composed of painted feathers were used in Mexico to express ideas; and by such figures Montezuma received intelligence of the Spanish invasion: in Peru, the only arithmetical figures known were knots of various colours, which served to cast up accounts. The second step naturally in the progress of the art of writing, is, to represent each word by a mark, termed a *letter*, which is the Chinese way of writing: they have about 11,000 of these marks or letters in common use; and in matters of science, they employ to the number of 60,000. Our way is far more easy and commodious: instead of marks or letters for words, which are infinite, we represent by marks or letters, the articulate sounds that compose words: these sounds exceed not thirty in number; and consequently the same number of marks or letters are sufficient for writing. This was at once to step from hieroglyphics, the

the most imperfect mode of writing, to letters representing sounds, the most perfect; for there is no probability that the Chinese mode was ever practis'd in this part of the world. With us, the learning to read is so easy as to be acquired in childhood; and we are ready for the sciences as soon as the mind is ripe for them: the Chinese mode, on the contrary, is an unsurmountable obstruction to knowledge; because it being the work of a lifetime to read with ease, no time remains for studying the sciences. Our case was in some measure the same at the restoration of learning: it required an age to be familiarized with the Greek and Latin tongues; and too little time remained for gathering knowledge out of their books. The Chinese stand upon a more equal footing with respect to arts; for these may be acquired by imitation or oral instruction, without books.

The art of writing with letters representing sounds, is of all inventions the most important, and the least obvious. The way of writing in China makes so naturally the second step in the progress of the art, that our good fortune in stumbling upon a way so much more perfect cannot be sufficiently admired, when to it we are indebted for our superiority in literature above the Chinese. Their way of writing is a fatal obstruction to science; for it is so rivetted by inveterate practice, that the difficulty would not be greater to make them change their language than their letters. Hieroglyphics were a sort of writing, so miserably imperfect, as to make every improvement welcome; but as the Chinese make a tolerable shift with their own letters, however cumbersome to those who know better, they never dream of any improvement. Hence it may be averred with great certainty, that in China, the sciences, tho' still in infancy, will for ever continue so.

The art of writing was known in Greece when Homer composed his two epics; for he gives somewhere a hint of it. It was at that

that time probably in its infancy, and used only for recording laws, religious precepts, or other short works. Ciphers, invented in Hindostan, were brought into France from Arabia about the end of the tenth century.

Husbandry made a progress from Egypt to Greece, and from Afric to Italy. Mago, a Carthaginian General, composed twenty-eight books upon husbandry, which were translated into Latin by order of the Roman senate. From these fine and fertile countries, it made its way to colder and less kindly climates. According to that progress, agriculture must have been practised more early in France than in Britain; and yet the English at present make a greater figure in that art than the French, inferiority in soil and climate notwithstanding. Before husbandry became an art in the northern parts of Europe, the French noblesse had deserted the country, fond of society in a town-life. Landed gentlemen in England, more rough, and delighting more in hunting and other country-amusements, found leisure to practise agriculture. Skill in that art proceeded from them to their tenants, who now prosecute husbandry with success, tho' their landlords have generally betaken themselves to a town-life.

When Cæsar invaded Britain, agriculture was unknown in the inner parts: the inhabitants fed upon milk and flesh, and were cloathed with skins. Hollinshed, cotemporary with Elisabeth of England, describes the rudeness of the preceding generation in the arts of life: "There were very few chimneys even in capital towns: the fire was laid to the wall, and the smoke issued out at the roof, or door, or window. The houses were wattled and plaistered over with clay; and all the furniture and utensils were of wood. The people slept on straw-pallets, with a log of wood for a pillow." Henry II. of France, at the marriage of the Duchess of Savoy, wore the first silk stockings that were made in France. Queen Elisabeth, the third year of her reign, received

ved in a present a pair of black silk knit stockings; and Dr Howel reports, that she never wore cloth hose any more. Before the conquest there was a timber bridge upon the Thames between London and Southwark, which was repaired by King William Rufus, and was burnt by accident in the reign of Henry II. ann. 1176. At that time a stone bridge in place of it was projected, but it was not finished till the year 1212. The bridge Notre-Dame over the Seine in Paris was first of wood. It fell down anno 1499; and as there was not in France a man who would undertake to rebuild it of stone, an Italian cordelier was employ'd, whose name was *Joconde*, the same upon whom Sanazarius made the following pun:

Jocondus geminum imposuit tibi, Sequana, pontem;

Hunc tu jure potes dicere pontificem.

The art of making glass was imported from France into England ann. 674, for the use of monasteries. Glass windows in private houses were rare even in the twelfth century, and held to be great luxury. King Edward III. invited three clockmakers of Delft in Holland to settle in England. In the former part of the reign of Henry VIII. there did not grow in England cabbage, carrot, turnip, or other edible root; and it has been noted, that even Queen Catharine herself could not command a salad for dinner, till the King brought over a gardener from the Netherlands. About the same time, the artichoke, the apricot, the damask rose, made their first appearance in England. Turkeys, carps, and hops, were first known there in the year 1524. The currant-shrub was brought from the island of Zant ann. 1533; and in the year 1540, cherry-trees from Flanders were first planted in Kent. It was in the year 1563 that knives were first made in England. Pocket-watches were brought there from Germany ann. 1577. About the year

1580,

1580, coaches were introduced; before which time Queen Elizabeth on public occasions rode behind her chamberlain. A saw-mill was erected near London ann. 1633, but afterward demolished, that it might not deprive the labouring poor of employment. How crude was the science of politics even in that late age?

People who are ignorant of weights and measures fall upon odd shifts to supply the defect. Howel Dha Prince of Wales, who died in the year 948, was their capital lawgiver. One of his laws is, "If any one kill or steal the cat that guards the Prince's granary, he forfeits a milch ewe with her lamb; or as much wheat as will cover the cat when suspended by the tail, the head touching the ground." By the same lawgiver a fine of twelve cows is enacted for a rape committed upon a maid, eighteen for a rape upon a matron. If the fact be proved after being denied, the criminal for his falsity pays as many shillings as will cover the woman's posteriors.

The negroes of the kingdom of Ardrah in Guinea have made great advances in arts. Their towns, for the most part, are fortified, and connected by great roads, kept in good repair. Deep canals from river to river are commonly filled with canoes, for pleasure some, and many for business. The vallies are pleasant, producing wheat, millet, yams, potatoes, lemons, oranges, coconuts, and dates. The marshy grounds near the sea are drained; and salt is made by evaporating the stagnating water. Salt is carried to the inland countries by the great canal of Ba, where numberless canoes are daily seen going with salt, and returning with gold dust or other commodities.

In all countries where the people are barbarous and illiterate, the progress of arts is wofully slow. It is vouched by an old French poem, that the virtues of the loadstone were known in France before the 1180. The mariner's compass was exhibited at Venice ann. 1260 by Paulus Venetus, as his own invention. John

Goya

Goya of Anaphi was the first who, many years afterward, used it in navigation; and also passed for being the inventor. Tho' it was used in China for navigation long before it was known in Europe, yet to this day it is not so perfect as in Europe. Instead of suspending it in order to make it act freely, it is placed upon a bed of sand, by which every motion of the ship disturbs its operation. Hand-mills, termed *guerns*, were early used for grinding corn; and when corn came to be raised in greater quantity, horse-mills succeeded. Water-mills for grinding corn are described by Vitruvius (a). Wind-mills were known in Greece and in Arabia as early as the seventh century; and yet no mention is made of them in Italy till the fourteenth century. That they were not known in England in the reign of Henry VIII, appears from a household book of an Earl of Northumberland, contemporary with that King, stating an allowance for three mill-horses, "two to draw in the mill, and one to carry stuff to the mill and fro." Water-mills for corn must in England have been of a later date. The ancients had mirror-glasses, and employ'd glass to imitate crystal vases and goblets: yet they never thought of using it in windows. In the thirteenth century, the Venetians were the only people who had the art of making crystal glass for mirrors. A clock that strikes the hours was unknown in Europe till the end of the twelfth century. And hence the custom of employing men to proclaim the hours during night; which to this day continues in Germany, Flanders, and England. Galileo was the first who conceived an idea that a pendulum might be useful for measuring time; and Hughens was the first who put the idea in execution, by making a pendulum clock. Hook, in the year 1660, invented a spiral spring for a watch, tho' a watch was far from being a new invention. Paper was made no

France before the 1180. The mariner's compass was exhibited at Venice ann. 1260 by Paulus Veneto, as his own invention. John

(a) L. 10. cap. 10.

earlier than the fourteenth century; and the invention of printing was a century later. Silk manufactures were long established in Greece before silk-worms were introduced there. The manufacturers were provided with raw silk from Persia: but that commerce being frequently interrupted by war, two monks, in the reign of Justinian, brought eggs of the silk-worm from Hindostan, and taught their countrymen the method of managing them. The art of reading made a very slow progress. To encourage that art in England, the capital punishment for murder was remitted if the criminal could but read, which in law-language is termed *benefit of clergy*. One would imagine that the art must have made a very rapid progress when so greatly favoured: but there is a signal proof of the contrary; for so small an edition of the Bible as six hundred copies, translated into English in the reign of Henry VIII. was not wholly sold off in three years. The people of England must have been profoundly ignorant in Queen Elizabeth's time, when a forged clause added to the twentieth article of the English creed passed unnoticed till about forty years ago*.

The discoveries of the Portuguese in the west coast of Africa, is a remarkable instance of the slow progress of arts. In the begin-

* In the act 13th Elizabeth anno 1571, confirming the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, these articles are not engrossed, but referred to as comprised in a printed book, intitled, *Articles agreed to by the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London 1562*. The forged clause is, "The church has power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith." In the articles referred to, that clause is not to be found, nor the slightest hint of any authority with respect to matters of faith. In the same year 1571, the articles were printed both in Latin and English, precisely as in the year 1562. But soon after came out spurious editions, in which the said clause was foisted into the twentieth article, and continues so to this day. A forgery so impudent would not pass at present; and its success shows great ignorance in the people of England at that period.

ning

ning of the fifteenth century, they were totally ignorant of that coast beyond Cape Non, 28 deg. north latitude. In the 1410 the celebrated Prince Henry of Portugal fitted out a fleet for discoveries, which proceeded along the coast to Cape Bojadore in 26 deg.; but had not courage to double it. In 1418 Tristan Vaz discovered the island Porto Santo; and the year after the island Madeira was discovered. In 1439 a Portuguese captain doubled Cape Bojadore; and the next year the Portuguese reached Cape Blanco, lat. 20 deg. In 1446 Nuna Tristan doubled Cape Verd, lat. 14° 40'. In 1448 Don Gonzallo Vallo took possession of the Azores. In the 1449 the islands of Cape Verd were discovered for Don Henry. In the 1471 Pedro d'Escovar discovered the island St Thomas and Prince's island. In 1484 Diego Cam discovered the kingdom of Congo. In 1486 Bartholemew Diaz, employ'd by John II. of Portugal, doubled the Cape of Good Hope, which he called *Cabo Tormentoso*, from the tempestuous weather he found in the passage.

The exertion of national spirit upon any particular art, promotes activity to prosecute other arts. The Romans, by constant study, came to excel in the art of war, which led them naturally to improve upon other arts. Having, in the progress of society, acquired some degree of taste and polish, a talent for writing broke forth. Nevius composed in verse seven books of the Punic war; beside comedies, replete with bitter raillery against the nobility (a). Ennius wrote annals, and an epic poem (b). Lucius Andronicus was the father of dramatic poetry in Rome (c). Pacu-

(a) Titus Livius, lib. 7. c. 2.

(b) Quintilian, lib. 10. c. 17.

(c) Cicero de oratore, lib. 2. No. 72.

vius wrote tragedies (a). Plautus and Terence wrote comedies. Lucilius composed satires, which Cicero esteems to be slight, and void of erudition (b). Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, Piso Frugi, Valerius Antias, and Cato, were rather annalists than historians, confining themselves to naked facts, ranged in order of time. The genius of the Romans for the fine arts was much inflamed by Greek learning, when free intercourse between the two nations was opened. Many of those who made the greatest figure in the Roman state, commenced authors, Cæsar, Cicero, &c. Sylla composed memoirs of his own transactions, a work much esteemed even in the days of Plutarch.

The progress of art seldom fails to be rapid, when a people happen to be roused out of a torpid state by some fortunate change of circumstances: prosperity contrasted with former abasement, gives to the mind a spring, which is vigorously exerted in every new pursuit. The Athenians made but a mean figure under the tyranny of Pisistratus; but upon regaining freedom and independence, they were converted into heroes. Miletus, a Greek city of Ionia, being destroy'd by the King of Persia, and the inhabitants made slaves; the Athenians, deeply affected with the misery of their brethren, boldly attacked that king in his own dominions, and burnt the city of Sardis. In less than ten years after, they gained a signal victory at Marathon; and under Themistocles, made head against that prodigious army with which Xerxes threatened utter ruin to Greece. Such prosperity produced its usual effect: arts flourished with arms, and Athens became the chief theatre for sciences as well as for fine arts. The reign of

(a) Cicero de oratore, lib. 2. No. 193.

(b) De finibus, lib. 1. No. 7.

Augustus Cæsar, which put an end to the rancour of civil war and restored peace to Rome with the comforts of society, proved an auspicious era for literature; and produced a cloud of Latin historians, poets, and philosophers, to whom the moderns are indebted for their taste and talents. One who makes a figure rouses emulation in all: one catches fire from another, and the national spirit is every where triumphant: classical works are composed, and useful discoveries made in every art and science. This fairly accounts for the following observation of Velleius Paterculus (a), that eminent men generally appear in the same period of time. "One age," says he, "produced Eschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, who advanced tragedy to a great height. In another age the old comedy flourished under Eupolis, Cratinus, and Aristophanes; and the new was invented by Menander, and his cotemporaries Diphilus and Philemon, whose compositions are so perfect that they left to posterity no hope of rivalry. The philosophic sages of the Socratic school, appeared all about the time of Plato and Aristotle. And as to rhetoric, few excelled in that art before Isocrates, and as few after the second descent of his scholars." The historian applies the same observation to the Romans, and extends it even to grammarians, painters, statuary, and sculptors. With regard to Rome, it is true, that the Roman government under Augustus was in effect despotic: but despotism, in that single instance, made no obstruction to literature, it having been the politic of that reign to hide power as much as possible. A similar revolution happened in Tuscany about three centuries ago. That country having been divided into a number of small republics, the people, excited by mutual hatred between small nations in close neighbourhood, became ferocious and bloody,

(a) Cicero de oratore, lib. 2. No. 137.

(a) Historia Romana, lib. 1. in fine.

(b) De finibus, lib. 1. No. 7.

flaming

flaming with revenge for the slightest offence. These republics being united under the Great Duke of Tuscany, enjoy'd the sweets of peace in a mild government. That comfortable revolution, which made the deeper impression by a retrospect to recent calamities, roused the national spirit, and produced ardent application to arts and literature. The restoration of the royal family in England, which put an end to a cruel and envenomed civil war, promoted improvements of every kind: arts and industry made a rapid progress among the people, tho' left to themselves by a weak and fluctuating administration. Had the nation, upon that favourable turn of fortune, been blessed with a succession of able and virtuous princes, to what a height might not arts and sciences have been carried! In Scotland, a favourable period for improvements was the reign of the first Robert, after shaking off the English yoke: but the domineering spirit of the feudal system rendered abortive every attempt. The restoration of the royal family, mentioned above, animated the legislature of Scotland to promote manufactures of various kinds: but in vain; for the union of the two crowns had introduced despotism into Scotland, which sunk the genius of the people, and rendered them heartless and indolent. Liberty indeed and many other advantages, were procured to them by the union of the two kingdoms; but these salutary effects were long suspended by mutual enmity, such as commonly subsists between neighbouring nations. Enmity wore out gradually, and the eyes of the Scots were opened to the advantages of their present condition: the national spirit was roused to emulate and to excel: talents were exerted, hitherto latent; and Scotland at present makes a figure in arts and sciences, above what it ever made while an independent kingdom*.

Another

* In Scotland, an innocent bankrupt imprisoned for debt, obtains liberty by a process termed *Cessio bonorum*. From the year 1694 to the 1744 there were but twenty.

Another cause of activity and animation, is the being engaged in some important action of doubtful event, a struggle for liberty, the resisting a potent invader, or the like. Greece, divided into small states frequently at war with each other, advanced literature and the fine arts to unrivalled perfection. The Corsicans, while engaged in a perilous war for defence of their liberties, exerted a vigorous national spirit: they founded an university for arts and sciences, a public library, and a public bank. After a long stupor during the dark ages of Christianity, arts and literature revived among the turbulent states of Italy. The royal society in London, and the academy of sciences in Paris, were both of them instituted after civil wars that had animated the people, and roused their activity.

An useful art is seldom lost, because it is in constant practice. And yet, tho' many useful arts were in perfection during the reign of Augustus Cæsar, it is amazing how ignorant and stupid men became, after the Roman empire was shattered by northern barbarians: they degenerated into savages. So ignorant were the Spanish Christians during the eighth and ninth centuries, that Alphonfus the Great, King of Leon, was reduced to the necessity of employing Mahometan preceptors for educating his eldest son. Even Charlemagne could not sign his name: nor was he singular in that respect, being kept in countenance by several neighbouring princes.

twenty-four processes of that kind; which shows how languidly trade was carried on while the people remained still ignorant of their advantages by the union. From that time to the year 1771 there have been thrice that number every year, taking one year with another; an evident proof of the late rapid progress of commerce in Scotland. Every one is roused to venture his small stock, tho' every one cannot be successful.

As

As the progress of arts and sciences toward perfection is greatly promoted by emulation, nothing is more fatal to an art or science than to remove that spur, as where some extraordinary genius appears who soars above rivalry. Mathematics seem to be declining in Britain: the great Newton, having surpassed all the ancients, has not left to the moderns even the faintest hope of equaling him; and what man will enter the lists who despairs of victory?

In early times, the inventors of useful arts were remembered with fervent gratitude. Their history became fabulous by the many incredible exploits that were attributed to them. Diodorus Siculus mentions the Egyptian tradition of Osiris, that with a numerous army he traversed every inhabited part of the globe, in order to teach men the culture of wheat and of the vine. Beside the impracticability of supporting a numerous army where husbandry is unknown, no army could enable Osiris to introduce wheat or wine among stupid savages who live by hunting and fishing, which probably was the case, in that early period, of all the nations he visited.

In a country thinly peopled, where even necessary arts want hands, it is common to see one person exercising more arts than one: in several parts of Scotland, one man serves as a physician, surgeon, and apothecary. In a very populous country, even simple arts are split into parts, and each part has an artist appropriated to it. In the large towns of ancient Egypt, a physician was confined to a single disease. In mechanic arts that method is excellent. As a hand confined to a single operation becomes both expert and expeditious, a mechanic art is perfected by having its different operations distributed among the greatest number of hands: many hands are employ'd in making a watch; and a still greater number in manufacturing a web of woollen cloth. Various arts or operations carried on by the same man, enervate his

his mind, because they exercise different faculties; and as he cannot be equally expert in every art or operation, he is frequently reduced to supply want of skill by thought and invention. Constant application, on the contrary, to a single operation, confines the mind to a single object, and excludes all thought and invention: in such a train of life, the operator becomes dull and stupid, like a beast of burden. The difference is visible in the manners of the people: in a country where, from want of hands, several occupations must be carried on by the same person, the people are knowing and conversable: in a populous country where manufactures flourish, they are ignorant and unsociable. The same effect is equally visible in countries where an art or manufacture is confined to a certain class of men. It is visible in Hindostan, where the people are divided into *casts*, which never mix even by marriage, and where every man follows his father's trade. The Dutch lint-boors are a similar instance: the same families carry on the trade from generation to generation; and are accordingly ignorant and brutish even beyond other Dutch peasants. The inhabitants of Buckhaven, a seaport in the county of Fife, were originally a colony of foreigners, invited hither to teach our people the art of fishing. They continue fishers to this day, marry among themselves, have little intercourse with their neighbours, and are dull and stupid to a proverb.

S E C T. II.

Progress of TASTE and of the FINE ARTS.

THE sense by which we perceive right and wrong in actions, is termed the *moral sense*: the sense by which we perceive beauty and deformity in objects, is termed *taste*. Perfection in the moral sense consists in perceiving the minutest differences of right and wrong: perfection in taste consists in perceiving the minutest differences of beauty and deformity; and such perfection is termed *delicacy of taste* (a).

The moral sense is born with us; and so is taste: yet both of them require much cultivation. Among savages, the moral sense is faint and obscure; and taste still more so*. Even in the most enlightened ages, it requires in a judge both education and experience to perceive accurately the various modifications of right and wrong: and to acquire delicacy of taste, a man must grow old in examining beauties and deformities. In Rome, abounding with productions of the fine arts, an illiterate shopkeeper is a more correct judge of statues, of pictures, and of buildings, than the

* Some Iroquois, after seeing all the beauties of Paris, admired nothing but the street De la Houchette, where they found a constant supply of eatables.

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 111, edit. 4.

best-educated citizen of London (a). Thus taste goes hand in hand with the moral sense in their progress toward maturity, and they ripen equally by the same sort of culture. Want, a barren soil, cramps the growth of both: sensuality, a soil too fat, corrupts both: the middle state, equally distant from dispiriting poverty and luxurious sensuality, is the soil in which both of them flourish.

As the fine arts are intimately connected with taste, it is impracticable, in tracing their progress, to separate them by accurate limits. I join therefore the progress of the fine arts to that of taste, where the former depends entirely on the latter; and I handle separately the progress of the fine arts, where that progress is influenced by other circumstances beside taste.

During the infancy of taste, imagination is suffered to roam, as in sleep, without control. Wonder is the passion of savages and of rustics; to raise which, nothing is necessary but to invent giants and magicians, fairy-land and enchantment. The earliest exploits recorded of warlike nations, are giants mowing down whole armies, and little men overcoming giants; witness Joannes Magnus, Torfeus, and other Scandinavian writers. Hence the absurd romances that delighted the world for ages; which are now fallen into contempt every where. Madame de la Fayette led the way to novels in the present mode. She was the first who introduced sentiments instead of wonderful adventures, and amiable men instead of bloody heroes. In substituting distresses to prodigies, she made a discovery that persons of taste and feeling are more attached by compassion than by wonder.

When gigantic fictions were banished, some remaining taste for the wonderful encouraged gigantic similes, metaphors, and allegories. The Song of Solomon, and many other Asiatic composi-

(a) Elements of Criticism, chap. 25.

tions, afford examples without end of such figures; which are commonly attributed to force of imagination in a warm climate. But a more extensive view will show this to be a mistake. In every climate, hot and cold, the figurative style is carried to extravagance, during a certain period in the progress of writing; a style that is relished by all at first, and continues to delight many till it yield to a taste polished by long experience. Even in the bitter cold country of Iceland, we are at no loss for examples. A rainbow is termed *Bridge of the gods*: gold, *Tears of Frea*: the earth is termed *Daughter of Night*, the vessel that floats upon Ages; and herbs and plants are her *hair*, or her *fleece*. Ice is termed *the great bridge*: a ship, *horse of the floods*. Many authors foolishly conjecture, that the Hurons and some other neighbouring nations, are of Asiatic extraction; because, like the Asiatics, their discourse is highly figurative.

The national progress of morality is slow: the national progress of taste is still slower. In proportion as a nation polishes, and improves in the arts of peace, taste ripens. The Chinese had long enjoy'd a regular system of government, while the Europeans were comparatively in a chaos; and accordingly literary compositions in China were brought to perfection more early than in Europe. In their poetry they indulge no incredible fables, like those of Ariosto or the Arabian Tales; but commonly select such as afford a good moral. Their novels, like those of the most approved kind among us, treat of misfortunes unforeseen, unexpected good luck, and persons finding out their real parents. The Orphan of China, composed in the fourteenth century, surpasses far any European play in that early period. But good writing has made a more rapid progress with us; not from superiority of talents, but from the great labour the Chinese must undergo, in learning to read and write their own language. The Chinese tragedy is indeed languid, and not sufficiently interesting; which Voltaire ascribes to

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho. Miserably low must taste have been in that period, when a childish play of words was relished as a proper decoration for a serious solemnity. The famous golden bull of Germany, digested anno 1356 by Bartolus, a celebrated lawyer, and intended for a master-piece of composition, is replete with wild conceptions, without the least regard to truth, propriety, or connection. It begins with an apostrophe to Pride, to Satan, to Choler, and to Luxury: it asserts, that there must be seven electors for opposing the seven mortal sins: The fall of the angels, terrestrial paradise, Pompey, and Cæsar, are introduced; and it is said, that Germany is founded on the Trinity, and on the three theological virtues. What can be more puerile! A sermon preached by the Bishop of Bitonto, at the opening of the council of Trent, excels in that manner of composition. He proves, that a council is necessary; because several councils have extirpated heresy, and deposed kings and emperors; because the poets assemble councils of the gods; because Moses writes, that at the creation of man and at confounding the language of the giants, God acted in the manner of a council; because religion has three heads, doctrine, sacraments, and charity, and that these three are termed *a council*. He exhorts the members of the council to strict unity, like the heroes in the Trojan horse. He asserts, that the gates of paradise and of the council are the same; that the holy fathers should sprinkle their dry hearts with the living water that flowed from it; and that otherwise the Holy Ghost would open their mouths like those of Balaam and Caiaphas (*a*). James I. of Britain dedicates his declaration against Vorstius to our Saviour, in the following words. "To the honour of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of the eternal Father, the only Theanthropos,

(*a*) Father Paul's history of Trent, lib. 1.

" mediator

“ mediator and reconciler of mankind ; in sign of thankfulness,
“ his most humble and obliged servant, James, by the grace
“ of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender
“ of the Faith, doth dedicate and consecrate this his declaration.”
Funeral orations were some time ago in fashion. Regnard,
who was in Stockholm about the year 1680, heard a funeral ora-
tion at the burial of a servant-maid. The priest, after mention-
ing her parents and the place of her birth, praised her as an ex-
cellent cook, and enlarged upon every ragout that she made in
perfection. She had but one fault, he said, which was the salting
her dishes too much ; but that she show’d thereby her prudence,
of which salt is the symbol ; a stroke of wit that probably was ad-
mired by the whole audience. Funeral orations are out of
fashion : the futility of a trite panegyric purchased with money,
and indecent flattery in circumstances that require sincerity and
truth, could not long stand against improved taste. The yearly
feast of the ass that carried the mother of God into Egypt, was a
most ridiculous farce, highly relished in the dark ages of Christiani-
ty. See the description of that feast in Voltaire’s general history (a).

The public amusements of our forefathers, show the grossness of
their taste after they were reduced to barbarism by the Goths and
Vandals. The plays termed *Mysteries*, because they were bor-
row’d from the scriptures, indicate gross manners as well as in-
fantine taste ; and yet in France, not farther back than three or
four centuries, these *Mysteries* were such favourites as constantly
to make a part at every public festival. The reformation of reli-
gion, which roused a spirit of inquiry, banished that amusement,
as not only low but indecent. A sort of plays succeeded, termed
Moralities, less indecent indeed, but scarce preferable in point of

(a) Chap. 78.

composition. These Moralities have also been long banished, except in Spain, where they still continue in vigour. The devil is commonly the hero: nor do the Spaniards make any difficulty, even in their more regular plays, to introduce supernatural and allegorical beings upon the same stage with men and women. The Cardinal Colonna carried into Spain a beautiful bust of the Emperor Caligula. In the war about the succession of Spain, after the death of its King Charles II. Lord Gallway, upon a painful search, found that bust serving as a weight to a church-clock.

In the days of our barbarous forefathers, who were governed by pride as well as by hatred, princes and men of rank entertained a changeling, distinguished by the name of *fool*; who being the butt of their silly jokes, flattered their vanity. Such amusement, not less gross than inhuman, could not show its face even in the dawn of taste: it was rendered less insipid and less inhuman, by entertaining one of real wit; who, under disguise of a fool, was indulged in the most satirical truths. Upon a further purification of taste, it was discovered, that to draw amusement from folly, real or pretended, is below the dignity of human nature. More refined amusements were invented, such as balls, public spectacles, gaming, and society with women. Parasites, described by Plautus and Terence, were of such a rank as to be permitted to dine with gentlemen; and yet were so despicable as to be the butt of every man's joke. They were placed at the lower end of the table; and the guests diverted themselves with daubing their faces, and even kicking and cuffing them; all which was patiently born for the sake of a plentiful meal. They resembled the fools and clowns of later times, being equally intended to be laughed at: but the parasite profession shows grosser manners; it being less indelicate to make game of fools, who were men of the lowest rank, than of parasites, who were gentlemen by birth, tho' not by behaviour.

Pride, which introduced fools, brought dwarfs also into fashion.

In

In Italy, fondness for dwarfs was carried to extravagance. "Being at Rome in the year 1566," says a French writer, "I was invited by Cardinal Vitelli to a feast, where we were served by no fewer than thirty-four dwarfs, most of them horridly distorted." Was not the taste of that Cardinal horridly distorted? The same author adds, that Francis I. and Henry II. Kings of France, had many dwarfs: one named *Gréat John* was the least ever had been seen, if it was not a dwarf at Milan, who was carried about in a cage.

In the eighth and ninth centuries, no sort of commerce was known in Europe but what was carried on in markets and fairs. Artificers and manufacturers were dispersed through the country, and so were monasteries; the towns being inhabited by none but clergymen, and those who immediately depended on them. The nobility lived on their estates, unless when they followed the court. The low people were not at liberty to quit the place of their birth: the *villain* was annexed to the estate, and the *slave*, to the person, of his lord. Slavery fostered rough manners; and there could be no improvement in manners, nor in taste, where there was no society. Of all the polite nations in Europe, the English were the latest of taking to a town-life; and their progress in taste and manners was proportionally slow. By no audience in the neighbouring kingdoms, would the following passage in one of Dryden's plays have been endured: "Jack Sauce! if I say it is a tragedy, it shall be a tragedy in spite of you: teach your grandam how to piss." These plays are full of such coarse stuff, and yet continued favourites down to the Revolution. For a long time after the revival of arts and sciences, Lucan was ranked above Virgil by every critic. Ben Johnson, and even Beaumont and Fletcher, were preferred before Shakespeare*; and the sublime genius of

* Yet Shakespeare spent his life in writing for such people. Unhappy Shakespeare! who, like his countryman Roger Bacon, lived in an age unworthy of him.

Milton made little impression for more than half a century after *Paradise Lost* was published. We have Dryden's authority that taste in his time was considerably refined:

"They who have best succeeded on the stage,

"Have still conform'd their genius to their age.

"Thus Johnson did mechanic humour show,

"When men were dull, and conversation low.

"Then comedy was faultless, but 'twas coarse:

"Cobb's Tankard was a jest, and Otter's Horse.

"Fame then was cheap, and the first comer sped:

"And they have kept it since by being dead.

"But were they now to write, when critics weigh

"Each line and ev'ry word throughout a play,

"None of them, no not Johnson in his height,

"Could pass without allowing grains for weight:

"If love and honour now are higher rais'd,

"It's not the poet, but the age is prais'd:

"Wit's now arriv'd to a more high degree,

"Our native language more refin'd and free.

"Our ladies and our men now speak more wit

"In conversation, than those poets writ."

The high opinion Dryden had of himself and of his age breaks

out in every line. Johnson probably had the same opinion of him-

self and of his age: the present age is not exempted from that bias;

nor will the next age be, tho' probably maturity in taste will be

still later. We humble ourselves before the antients who are far

removed from us; but not to soar above our immediate prede-

cessors, would be a sad mortification. Many scenes in Dryden's

plays, if not lower than Cobb's Tankard or Otter's Horse, are more

out

out of place. In the *Wild Gallant*, the hero is a wretch constantly employ'd, not only in cheating his creditors, but in cheating his mistress, a lady of high rank and fortune. And how absurd is the scene, where he convinces the father of his mistress that the devil had got him with child! The character of Sir Martin Mar-all is below contempt. The scenes in the same play, of a bawd instructing one of her novices how to behave to her gallants, and of the novice practising her lessons, are perhaps not lower than Cobb's Tankard or Otter's Horse, but surely they are less innocent.

Portugal was rising in power and splendor when Camoens wrote the *Lusiad*; and with respect to the music of verse it has merit. The author however is far from shining in point of taste. He makes a strange jumble of Heathen and Christian Deities. "Gama," observes Voltaire, "in a storm addresses his prayers to "Christ, but it is Venus who comes to his relief." Voltaire's observation is but too well founded. In the first book, Jove summons a council of the gods, which is described at great length, for no earthly purpose but to show that he favoured the Portuguese. Bacchus, on the other hand, declares against them upon the following account, that he himself had gained immortal glory as conqueror of the Indies; which would be eclipsed if the Indies should be conquered a second time by the Portuguese. A Moorish commander having received Gama with smiles, but with hatred in his heart, the poet brings down Bacchus from heaven to confirm the Moor in his wicked purposes; which would have been perpetrated, had not Venus interposed in Gama's behalf. In the second canto, Bacchus feigns himself to be a Christian, in order to deceive the Portuguese; but Venus implores her father Jupiter to protect them. And yet, after all, I am loth to condemn an early writer for introducing Heathen Deities as actors in a real history, when in the age of Lewis XIV. celebrated for refinement of

taste, we find French writers, Boileau in particular, guilty sometimes of the same absurdity (a).

Tho' taste in France is more correct than in any other nation, it will bear still some purification. The scene of a clyster-pipe in Moliere is too low even for a farce; and yet to this day it is acted, with a few softenings, before the most polite audience in Europe.

In Elements of Criticism (b) several causes are mentioned that may retard taste in its progress toward maturity, and that still more effectually may give it a retrograde motion when it is in maturity. There are many biases both natural and acquired that tend to mislead persons even of the best taste. Of the latter, instances are without number. I select one or two to show what influence even the slightest circumstances have on taste. The only tree beautiful at all seasons is the holly: in winter, its deep and shining green intitles it to be the queen of the grove: in summer, this colour completes the harmonious mixture of shades so pleasing in that season! Mrs D—— is lively and sociable. She in particular is eminent above most of her sex for a correct taste, display'd not only within doors but in the garden and in the field. Having become mistress of a great house by matrimony, the most honourable of all titles, a group of tall hollies, which had long been suffered to obscure a capital room, soon attracted her eye. She took an aversion to a holly, and was not at ease till the group was extirpated. Such a bias is perfectly harmless. What follows is not altogether so excusable. The Oxonians disliked the great Newton because he was educated at Cambridge; and they favoured every book writ against him. That bias, I hope, has not come down to the present time.

(a) Elements of Criticism, chap. 22.

(b) Chap. 25.

Refinement of taste in a nation is always accompanied with refinement of manners: people accustomed to behold order and elegance in public buildings and public gardens, acquire urbanity in private. But it is irksome to trudge long in a beaten track, familiar to all the world; and therefore, leaving what is said above, like a statue curtail'd of legs and arms, I hasten to the history of the fine arts.

Useful arts paved the way to fine arts. Men upon whom the former had bestow'd every convenience, turned their thoughts to the latter. Beauty was studied in objects of sight; and men of taste attached themselves to the fine arts, which multiply'd their enjoyments and improved their benevolence. Sculpture and painting made an early figure in Greece; which afforded plenty of beautiful originals to be copied in these imitative arts. Statuary, a more simple imitation than painting, was sooner brought to perfection: the statue of Jupiter by Phidias and of Juno by Polycletes, tho' the admiration of all the world, were executed long before the art of light and shade was known. Apollodorus, and Zeuxis his disciple, who flourished in the fifteenth Olympiad, were the first who figured in that art. Another cause concurred to advance statuary before painting in Greece, viz. a great demand for statues of their gods. Architecture, as a fine art, made a slower progress. Proportions, upon which its elegance chiefly depends, cannot be accurately ascertained, but by an infinity of trials in great buildings: a model cannot be relied on; for a large and a small building even of the same form, require different proportions. Gardening, however, made a still slower progress than architecture: the palace of Alcinoous, in the seventh book of the *Odyssy*, is grand and highly ornamented; but his garden is no better than what we term a kitchen-garden.

The ancient churches in this island cannot be our own invention, being unfit for a cold climate. The vast space they occupy, quantity

quantity of stone, and gloominess by excluding the sun, afford a refreshing coolness, and fit them for a hot climate only. It is highly probable that they have been copied from the mosques in the south of Spain, erected there by the Saracens. Spain, when possessed by that people, was the centre of arts and sciences, and led the fashion in every thing beautiful and magnificent.

From the fine arts mentioned, we proceed to literature. It is agreed among all antiquaries, that the first writings were in verse, and that writing in prose was of a much later date. The first Greek who wrote in prose, was Pherecides Syrus: the first Roman, was Appius Cæcus, who composed a declamation against Pyrrhus. The four books of the Chatah Bhade, which is the sacred book of Hindostan, are composed in verse stanzas; and the Arabian compositions in prose followed long after those in verse. To account for that singular fact, many learned pens have been employ'd; but without success. By some it has been urged, that as memory is the only record of events where writing is unknown, history originally was composed in verse for the sake of memory. This is not satisfactory. To undertake the painful task of composing in verse merely for the sake of memory, would require more foresight than ever was exerted by a barbarian; not to mention that other means were used for preserving the memory of remarkable events, a heap of stones, a pillar, or other object that catches the eye. The account given by Longinus is more ingenious. In a fragment of his treatise on verse, the only part that remains, he observes, "that measure or verse belongs to poetry, because "poetry represents the various passions with their language; for "which reason the ancients, in their ordinary discourse, delivered "their thoughts in verse rather than in prose." Longinus thought, that anciently men were more exposed to accidents and dangers, than when they were protected by good government and by fortified cities. But he seems not to have adverted, that fear and

and grief, inspired by dangers and misfortunes, are better suited to humble prose than to elevated verse. I add, that however natural poetical diction may be when one is animated with any vivid passion, it is not supposable that the ancients never wrote nor spoke but when excited by passion. Their history, their laws, their covenants, were certainly not composed in that tone of mind.

An important article in the progress of the fine arts, which writers have not sufficiently attended to, will, if I mistake not, explain this mystery. The article is the profession of a bard, which sprung up in early times before writing was known, and died away gradually as writing turned more and more common. The curiosity of man is great with respect to the transactions of his own species; and when such transactions are described in verse accompanied with music, the performance is enchanting. An ear, a voice, skill in instrumental music, and above all a poetical genius, are requisite to excel in that complicated art. As such talents are rare, the few that possessed them were highly esteemed; and hence the profession of a bard, which, beside natural talents, required more culture and exercise than any other known art. Bards were capital persons at every festival and at every solemnity. Their songs, which, by recording the achievements of kings and heroes, animated every hearer, must have been the entertainment of every warlike nation. We have Hesiod's authority, that in his time bards were as common as potters or joiners, and as liable to envy. Demodocus is mentioned by Homer as a celebrated bard (a); and Phemius, another bard, is introduced by him deprecating the wrath of Ulysses, in the following words.

"their thoughts in verse rather than in prose." Longinus thought that anciently men were more exposed to reproach and dangers, than when they were protected by good government and by fortified cities. But he seems not to have advanced, that fear

(a) *Odyssey* b. 8.

"O king! to mercy be thy soul inclin'd,
 "And spare the poet's ever-gentle kind.
 "A deed like this thy future fame would wrong,
 "For dear to gods and men is sacred song.
 "Self-taught I sing; by heav'n, and heav'n alone,
 "The genuine seeds of poesy are sown;
 "And (what the gods bestow) the lofty lay,
 "To gods alone, and godlike worth, we pay.
 "Save then the poet, and thyself reward;
 "'Tis thine to merit, mine is to record."

Cicero reports, that at Roman festivals anciently, the virtues and exploits of their great men were sung (a). The same custom prevailed in Peru and Mexico, as we learn from Garcilasso and other authors. Strabo (b) gives a very particular account of the Gallic bards. The following quotation is from Ammianus Marcellinus (c). "Bardi quidem fortia virorum illustrium facta, heroicis composita versibus, cum dulcibus lyræ modulis, cantantur." We have for our authority Father Gobien, that even the inhabitants of the Marian islands have bards, who are greatly admired, because in their songs are celebrated the feats of their ancestors. There are traces of the same kind among the Apalachites in North America *. And we shall see afterward (d), that

in

(a) Tusculan Questions, lib. 4. N° 3. & 4.

(b) Lib. 4.

(c) Lib. 15. cap. 9.

(d) Sketch 7. Progress of Manners.

* The first seal that a young Greenlander catches is made a feast for the family and neighbours. The young champion, during the repast, descants upon his address in catching the animal: the guests admire his dexterity, and extol the flavour of

in no other part of the world were bards more honoured than in Britain and Scandinavia.

Bards were the only historians before writing was introduced. Tacitus (a) says, that the songs of the German bards were their only annals. And Joannes Magnus Archbishop of Upsal acknowledges, that in compiling his history of the ancient Goths, he had no other records but the songs of the bards. As these songs made an illustrious figure at every festival, they were convey'd in every family by parents to their children; and in that manner were kept alive before writing was known.

The invention of writing made a considerable change in the bard-profession. It is now an agreed point, that no poetry is fit to be accompanied with music, but what is simple: a complicated thought or description requires the utmost attention, and leaves none for the music; or if it divide the attention, it makes but a faint impression (b). The simple operas of Quinault bear away the palm from every thing of the kind composed by Boileau or Racine. But when a language, in its progress to maturity, is en-

of the meat. Their only music is a sort of drum, which accompanies a song in praise of seal-catching, in praise of their ancestors, or in welcoming the sun's return to them. Here are the rudiments of the bard-profession. The song is made for a chorus, as many of our ancient songs are. Take the following example.

“ The welcome sun returns again,

“ Amna ajah, ajah, ah-hu !

“ And brings us weather fine and fair.

“ Amna ajah, ajah, ah-hu !

The bard sings the first and third lines, accompanying it with his drum and with a sort of dance. The other lines, termed the burden of the song, are sung by the guests.

(a) De moribus Germanorum, cap. 2.

(b) See Elements of Criticism, vol. 2. Appendix.

riched with variety of phrases fit to express the most elevated thoughts, men of genius aspired to the higher strains of poetry, leaving music and song to the bards; which distinguished the profession of a poet from that of a bard. Homer, in a lax sense, may be termed a bard; for in that character he strolled from feast to feast. But he was not a bard in the original sense: he indeed recited his poems to crowded audiences; but his poems are too complex for music, and he probably did not sing them, nor accompany them with the lyre. The Trovadores of Provence were bards in the original sense; and made a capital figure in days of ignorance, when few could read, and fewer write. In later times the songs of the bards were taken down in writing, which gave every one access to them without a bard; and the profession sunk by degrees into oblivion. Among the highlanders of Scotland, reading and writing in their own tongue is not common even at present; and that circumstance supported long the bard-profession among them, after being forgot among neighbouring nations. Ossian was the most celebrated bard in Caledonia, as Homer was in Greece*.

After the foregoing historical deduction, the reader will perceive without my assistance why the first writings were in verse. The songs of the bards, being universal favourites, were certainly the first compositions that writing was employ'd upon: they would be carefully collected by the most skilful writers, in order to preserve

* The multitude are struck with what is new and splendid, but seldom continue long in a wrong taste. Voltaire holds it to be a strong testimony for the *Gierusalem Liberata*, that even the gondoliers in Venice have it mostly by heart; and that one no sooner pronounces a stanza than another carries it on. The works of Ossian have the same testimony for them: there are not many highlanders, even of the lowest rank, but can repeat long passages out of them.

them in perpetual remembrance. The following part of the progress is equally obvious. People acquainted with no written compositions but what were in verse, composed in verse their laws, their religious ceremonies, and every memorable transaction that was intended to be preserved in memory by writing. But when subjects of writing multiplied and became more and more involved, when people began to reason, to teach, and to harangue, they were obliged to descend to humble prose: for to confine a writer or speaker to verse in handling subjects of that nature, would be a burden unupportable.

The prose compositions of early historians are all of them dramatic. A writer destitute of art is naturally prompted to relate facts as he saw them performed: he introduces his personages as speaking and conferring, and he himself relates what was acted and not spoke. The historical books of the Old Testament are composed in that mode; and so addicted to the dramatic are the authors of those books, that they frequently introduce God himself into the dialogue. At the same time, the simplicity of that mode is happily suited to the poverty of every language in its early periods. The dramatic mode has a delicious effect in expressing sentiments, and every thing that is simple and tender (a). Take the following instance of a low incident becoming by that means not a little interesting. Naomi having lost her husband and her two sons in foreign parts, and purposing to return to the land of her forefathers, said to her two daughters in law, "Go, return each to her mother's house: the LORD deal kindly with you, as ye have dealt with the dead, and with me. The LORD grant you that you may find rest, each of you in the house of her husband. Then she kissed them, and they lift up their voice and

(a) See Elements of Criticism, chap. 22.

“wept. And they said unto her, Surely we will return with thee
“unto thy people. And Naomi said, Turn again, my daughters:
“why will ye go with me? are there yet any more sons in
“my womb, that they may be your husbands? Turn again,
“my daughters, go your way, for I am too old to have an husband:
“if I should say, I have hope, if I should have a husband
“also to night, and should also bear sons; would ye tarry for
“them till they were grown? would ye stay for them from having
“husbands? nay, my daughters: for it grieveth me much
“for your sakes, that the hand of the LORD is gone out against
“me. And they lift up their voice, and wept again: and Orpah
“kissed her mother in law, but Ruth clave unto her. And she
“said, Behold, thy sister in law is gone back unto her people,
“and unto her gods: return thou after thy sister in law. And
“Ruth said, Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following
“after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and
“where thou lodgest I will lodge: thy people shall be my people,
“and thy God my God: where thou diest, will I die, and there
“will I be buried: the LORD do so to me, and more also, if
“ought but death part thee and me. When she saw that she was
“stedfastly minded to go with her, then she left speaking unto
“her.

“So they two went until they came to Beth-lehem. And it
“came to pass when they were come to Beth-lehem, that all the
“city was moved about them, and they said, Is this Naomi?
“And she said unto them, Call me not Naomi, call me Mara:
“for the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me. I went out
“full, and the LORD hath brought me home again empty: why
“then call ye me Naomi, seeing the LORD hath testified against
“me, and the Almighty hath afflicted me? So Naomi returned,
“and Ruth the Moabitess her daughter in law with her, which
“returned

“ returned out of the country of Moab: and they came to Beth-lehem in the beginning of barley-harvest.

“ And Naomi had a kinsman of her husband's, a mighty man of wealth, of the family of Elimelech; and his name was Boaz.

“ And Ruth the Moabitess said unto Naomi, Let me now go to the field, and glean ears of corn after him in whose sight I shall find grace. And she said unto her, Go, my daughter.

“ And she went, and came, and gleaned in the field after the reapers: and her hap was to light on a part of the field belonging unto Boaz, who was of the kindred of Elimelech.

“ And behold, Boaz came from Beth-lehem, and said unto the reapers, The LORD be with you: and they answered him, The LORD bless thee. Then said Boaz unto his servant that was

“ set over the reapers, Whose damsel is this? And the servant that was set over the reapers answered and said, It is the Moabitish damsel that came back with Naomi, out of the country

“ of Moab: and she said, I pray you, let me glean, and gather after the reapers, amongst the sheaves: so she came, and hath continued even from the morning until now, that she tarried

“ a little in the house. Then said Boaz unto Ruth, Hearest thou not, my daughter? Go not to glean in another field, neither go from hence, but abide here fast by my maidens. Let thine

“ eyes be on the field that they do reap, and go thou after them: have I not charged the young men, that they shall not touch thee? and when thou art athirst, go unto the vessels, and drink

“ of that which the young men have drawn. Then she fell on her face, and bowed herself to the ground, and said unto him, Why have I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldst take

“ knowledge of me, seeing I am a stranger? And Boaz answered and said unto her, It hath fully been shewed me all that thou hast done unto thy mother in law since the death of thine

“ husband: and how thou hast left thy father and thy mother,

“ and

“and the land of thy nativity, and art come unto a people which
“thou knewest not heretofore. The LORD recompense thy work,
“and a full reward be given thee of the LORD God of Israel, un-
“der whose wings thou art come to trust. Then she said, Let me
“find favour in thy sight, my lord, for that thou hast comforted
“me, and for that thou hast spoken friendly unto thine hand-
“maid, though I be not like unto one of thine handmaidens.
“And Boaz said unto her, At meal-time come thou hither, and
“eat of the bread, and dip thy morsel in the vinegar. And she
“sat beside the reapers: and he reached her parched corn, and
“she did eat, and was sufficed, and left. And when she was
“risen up to glean, Boaz commanded his young men, saying,
“Let her glean even among the sheaves, and reproach her not.
“And let fall also some of the handfuls of purpose for her, and
“leave them, that she may glean them, and rebuke her not. So
“she gleaned in the field until even, and beat out that she had
“gleaned: and it was about an ephah of barley.
“And she took it up, and went into the city: and her mother
“in law saw what she had gleaned: and she brought forth, and
“gave to her that she had reserved, after she was sufficed. And
“her mother in law said unto her, Where hast thou gleaned to-
“day? and where wroughtest thou? blessed be he that did take
“knowledge of thee. And she shewed her mother in law with
“whom she had wrought, and said, The mans name with whom
“I wrought to day, is Boaz. And Naomi said unto her daughter
“in law, Blessed be he of the LORD, who hath not left off his
“kindness to the living and to the dead. And Naomi said unto
“her, The man is near of kin unto us, one of our next kinsmen.
“And Ruth the Moabitess said, He said unto me also, Thou
“shalt keep fast by my young men, until they have ended all my
“harvest. And Naomi said unto Ruth her daughter in law, It is
“good, my daughter, that thou go out with his maidens, that
“they

" they meet thee not in any other field. So she kept fast by the maidens of Boaz to glean, unto the end of barley-harvest, and of wheat-harvest; and dwelt with her mother in law."

" Then Naomi her mother in law said unto her, My daughter, shall I not seek rest for thee, that it may be well with thee?"

" And now is not Boaz of our kindred, with whose maidens thou wast? Behold he winnoweth barley to night in the threshing-floor. Wash thy self therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee, and get thee down to the floor; but make not thyself known unto the man, until he shall have done eating and drinking. And it shall be when he lieth down, that thou shalt mark the place where he shall lie, and thou shalt go in, and uncover his feet, and lay thee down, and he will tell thee what thou shalt do. And she said unto her, All that thou sayst unto me, I will do."

" And she went down unto the floor, and did according to all that her mother in law bade her. And when Boaz had eaten and drunk, and his heart was merry, he went to lie down at the end of the heap of corn: and she came softly, and uncovered his feet, and laid her down."

" And it came to pass at midnight, that the man was afraid, and turned himself: and behold, a woman lay at his feet. And he said, Who art thou? And she answered, I am Ruth thine handmaid: spread therefore thy skirt over thine handmaid, for thou art a near kinsman. And he said, Blessed be thou of the Lord, my daughter: for thou hast shewed more kindness in the latter end, than at the beginning, inasmuch as thou followedst not young men, whether poor or rich. And now, my daughter, fear not, I will do to thee all that thou requirest; for all the city of my people doth know, that thou art a virtuous woman. And now it is true, that I am thy near kinsman: howbeit there is a kinsman nearer than I. Tarry this night, and it shall

“shall be in the morning, that if he will perform unto thee the
“part of a kinsman, well, let him do the kinsmans part; but if
“he will not do the part of a kinsman to thee, then will I do the
“part of a kinsman to thee, as the LORD liveth: lie down until
“the morning.

“And she lay at his feet until the morning: and she rose up
“before one could know another. And he said, Let it not be
“known that a woman came into the floor. Also he said, Bring
“the vail that thou hast upon thee, and hold it. And when she
“held it, he measured six measures of barley, and laid it on her:
“and she went into the city. And when she came to her mo-
“ther in law, she said, Who art thou, my daughter? And she
“told her all that the man had done to her. And she said, These
“six measures of barley gave he me; for he said to me, Go not
“empty unto thy mother in law. Then said she, Sit still, my
“daughter, until thou know how the matter will fall: for the
“man will not be in rest, until he have finished the thing this
“day.

“Then went Boaz up to the gate, and sat him down there:
“and behold, the kinsman of whom Boaz spake, came by; unto
“whom he said, Ho, such a one, turn aside, sit down here.
“And he turned aside and sat down. And he took ten men of
“the elders of the city, and said, Sit ye down here. And they
“sat down. And he said unto the kinsman, Naomi that is come
“again out of the country of Moab, selleth a parcel of land,
“which was our brother Elimelech's. And I thought to adver-
“tise thee, saying, Buy it before the inhabitants, and before the
“elders of my people. If thou wilt redeem it, redeem it; but if
“thou wilt not redeem it, then tell me, that I may know: for
“there is none to redeem it besides thee, and I am after thee. And
“he said, I will redeem it. Then said Boaz, What day thou
“buyest the field of the hand of Naomi, thou must buy it also of

“Ruth

"Ruth the Moabiteſs, the wife of the dead, to raiſe up the name
"of the dead upon his inheritance.

"And the kinfman ſaid, I cannot redeem it for my ſelf, leſt I mar
"mine own inheritance: redeem thou my right to thy ſelf, for I
"cannot redeem it. Now this was the manner in former time in
"Iſrael, concerning redeeming, and concerning changing, for to
"confirm all things: a man plucked off his ſhoe, and gave it to
"his neighbour: and this was a teſtimony in Iſrael. Therefore
"the kinfman ſaid unto Boaz, Buy it for thee: ſo he drew off his
"ſhoe.

"And Boaz ſaid unto the elders, and unto all the people, Ye are
"witnesses this day, that I have bought all that was Elimelech's,
"and all that was Chilion's, and Mahlon's, of the hand of Naomi.
"Moreover, Ruth the Moabiteſs, the wife of Mahlon, have I
"purchaſed to be my wife, to raiſe up the name of the dead upon
"his inheritance, that the name of the dead be not cut off from
"among his brethren, and from the gate of his place: ye are wit-
"neſſes this day. And all the people that were in the gate, and
"the elders ſaid, We are witnessſes: The LORD make the woman
"that is come into thine houſe, like Rachel, and like Leah,
"which two did build the houſe of Iſrael: and do thou worthily
"in Ephrath, and be famous in Beth-lehem. And let thy houſe
"be like the houſe of Pharez (whom Tamar bare unto Judah) of
"the ſeed which the LORD ſhall give thee of this young wo-
"man.

"So Boaz took Ruth, and ſhe was his wife: and when he went
"in unto her, the LORD gave her conception, and ſhe bare a
"ſon. And the women ſaid unto Naomi, Blessed be the LORD,
"which hath not left thee this day without a kinfman, that his
"name may be famous in Iſrael. And he ſhall be unto thee a re-
"ſtorer of thy life, and a nourisher of thine old age: for thy
"daughter in law which loveth thee, which is better to thee than

“ seven sons, hath born him. And Naomi took the child, and
 “ laid it in her bosom, and became nurse unto it (a).”

The dramatic mode is far from pleasing so much in relating bare historical facts. Take the following example.

“ Wherefore Nathan spake unto Bath-sheba the mother of Solomon, saying, Hast thou not heard that Adonijah the son of Haggith doth reign, and David our lord knoweth it not? Now therefore come, let me, I pray thee, give thee counsel, that thou mayst save thine own life, and the life of thy son Solomon. Go, and get thee in unto king David, and say unto him, Didst not thou, my lord O king, swear unto thine handmaid, saying, Assuredly Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne? why then doth Adonijah reign? Behold, while thou yet talkest there with the king, I will also come in after thee, and confirm thy words.

“ And Bath-sheba went in unto the king, into the chamber: and the king was very old; and Abishag the Shunammite ministered unto the king. And Bath-sheba bowed, and did obeisance unto the king: and the king said, What wouldst thou? And she said unto him, My lord, thou sweardest by the LORD thy God unto thine handmaid, saying, Assuredly Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne: and now behold, Adonijah reigneth; and now my lord the king, thou knowest it not. And he hath slain oxen, and fat cattle, and sheep in abundance, and hath called all the sons of the king, and Abiathar the priest, and Joab the captain of the host: but Solomon thy servant hath he not called. And thou, my lord O king, the eyes of all Israel are upon thee, that thou shouldst tell them who shall sit on the throne of my lord the

king

(a) Ruth, i. 8. — iv. 16.

“ king after him. Otherwise it shall come to pass, when my lord
“ the king shall sleep with his fathers, that I and my son Solo-
“ mon shall be counted offenders.

“ And lo, while she yet talked with the king, Nathan the pro-
“ phet also came in. And they told the king, saying, Behold,
“ Nathan the prophet. And when he was come in before the
“ king, he bowed himself before the king with his face to the
“ ground. And Nathan said, My lord O king, hast thou said,
“ Adonijah shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne?
“ For he is gone down this day, and hath slain oxen, and fat
“ cattle, and sheep in abundance, and hath called all the king’s
“ sons, and the captains of the host, and Abiathar the priest; and
“ behold, they eat and drink before him, and say, God save
“ king Adonijah. But me, even me thy servant, and Zadok the
“ priest, and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, and thy servant Solo-
“ mon hath he not called. Is this thing done by my lord the king,
“ and thou hast not shewed it unto thy servant, who should sit on
“ the throne of my lord the king after him?

“ Then king David answered and said, Call me Bath-sheba:
“ and she came into the king’s presence, and stood before the
“ king. And the king sware, and said, As the LORD liveth, that
“ hath redeemed my soul out of all distress, even as I sware un-
“ to thee by the LORD God of Israel, saying, Assuredly Solomon
“ thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne
“ in my stead; even so will I certainly do this day. Then Bath-
“ sheba bowed with her face to the earth, and did reverence to
“ the king, and said, Let my lord king David live for ever.

“ And king David said, Call me Zadok the priest, and Nathan
“ the prophet, and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada. And they came
“ before the king. The king also said unto them, Take with you
“ the servants of your lord, and cause Solomon my son to ride
“ upon mine own mule, and bring him down to Gihon. And

“let Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet, anoint him there
“king over Israel: and blow ye with the trumpet, and say, God
“save king Solomon. Then ye shall come up after him; that he
“may come and sit upon my throne; for he shall be king in my
“stead: and I have appointed him to be ruler over Israel, and o-
“ver Judah. And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada answered the
“king, and said, Amen: the LORD God of my lord the king say
“so too. As the LORD hath been with my lord the king, even so
“be he with Solomon, and make his throne greater then the throne
“of my lord king David. So Zadok the priest, and Nathan the
“prophet, and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, and the Cherethites
“and the Pelethites, went down, and caused Solomon to ride up-
“on king David’s mule, and brought him to Gihon. And Zadok
“the priest took an horn of oyl out of the tabernacle, and anoint-
“ed Solomon: and they blew the trumpet, and all the people
“said, God save king Solomon. And all the people came up af-
“ter him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with
“great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them.
“And Adonijah, and all the guests that were with him, heard
“it, as they had made an end of eating: and when Joab heard
“the sound of the trumpet, he said, Wherefore is this noise of
“the city, being in an uprore? And while he yet spake, behold,
“Jonathan the son of Abiathar the priest came, and Adonijah
“said unto him, Come in, for thou art a valiant man, and
“bringest good tidings. And Jonathan answered and said to A-
“donijah, Verily our lord king David hath made Solomon king.
“And the king has sent with him Zadok the priest, and Nathan
“the prophet, and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, and the Chere-
“thites, and the Pelethites, and they have caused him to ride up-
“on the king’s mule. And Zadok the priest, and Nathan the
“prophet have anointed him king in Gihon: and they are come
“up from thence rejoicing, so that the city rang again: this is
“the

"the noise that ye have heard. And also Solomon sitteth on the throne of the kingdom. And moreover the king's servants came to bless our lord king David, saying, God make the name of Solomon better than thy name, and make his throne greater than thy throne: and the king bowed himself upon the bed. And also thus said the king, Blessed be the LORD God of Israel, which hath given one to sit on my throne this day, mine eyes even seeing it. And all the guests that were with Adonijah were afraid, and rose up, and went every man his way (a)".

In the example here given are found frequent repetitions; not however by the same person, but by different persons who have occasion in the course of the story to say the same things; which is natural in the dramatic mode, where things are represented precisely as they were transacted. In that view, Homer's repetitions are a beauty, not a blemish; for they are confined to the dramatic part, and never occur in the narrative.

But the dramatic mode of composition, however pleasing, is tedious and intolerable in a long history. In the progress of society new appetites and new passions arise; men come to be involved with each other in various connections; incidents and events multiply, and history becomes intricate by an endless variety of circumstances. Dialogue accordingly is more sparingly used, and in history plain narration is mixed with it. Narration is as it were the ground-work, and dialogue is raised upon it, like flowers in embroidery. Homer is admitted by all to be the great master in that mode of composition. Nothing can be more perfect in that respect than the Iliad. The Odyssey is far inferior; and to guard myself against the censure of the blind admirers of Homer, a tribe extremely formidable, I call to my

• 1 Kings, i. 11. — 49.

aid a celebrated critic, whose superior taste and judgement never has been disputed. "The *Odyssey*," says Longinus, "shows how natural it is for a writer of a great genius, in his declining age, to sink down to fabulous narration; for that Homer composed the *Odyssey* after the *Iliad* is evident from many circumstances. As the *Iliad* was composed while his genius was in its greatest vigour, the structure of that work is dramatic and full of action; the *Odyssey*, on the contrary, is mostly employ'd in narration, proceeding from the coldness of old age. In that later composition, Homer may be compared to the setting sun, which has still the same greatness, but not the same ardor or force. We see not in the *Odyssey* that sublime of the *Iliad* which constantly proceeds in the same animated tone, that strong tide of motions and passions flowing successively like waves in a storm. But Homer, like the ocean, is great, even when he ebbs, and loses himself in narration and incredible fictions; witness his description of tempests, the adventures of Ulysses with Polyphemus the Cyclops, and many others *."

The narrative mode came in time so to prevail, that in a long chain of history, the writer commonly leaves off dialogue altogether. Early writers of that kind appear to have very little judgement in distinguishing capital facts from minute circumstances, such as can be supply'd by the reader without being mentioned. The history of the Trojan war by Dares Phrygius is a curious instance of that cold and creeping manner of composition. Take the following passage. Hercules having made a descent upon Troy, slew King

* The *Pilgrim's Progress* and *Robinson Crusoe*, great favourites of the vulgar, are composed in a style enlivened like that of Homer by a proper mixture of the dramatic and narrative; and upon that account chiefly have been translated into several European languages.

Laomedon,

Laomedon, and made a present of Hefione, the King's daughter, to Telamon his companion. Priamus, who succeeded to the kingdom of Troy upon the death of his father Laomedon, sent Antenor to demand his sister Hefione. Our author proceeds in the following manner. "Antenor, as commanded by Priamus, took shipping, and sailed to Magnesia, where Peleus resided. Peleus entertained him hospitably three days, and the fourth day demanded whence he came. Antenor said, that he was ordered by Priamus to demand from the Greeks, that they should restore Hefione. When Peleus heard this he was angry, because it concerned his family, Telamon being his brother; and ordered the ambassador to depart. Antenor, without delay, retired to his ship, and sailed to Salamis, where Telamon resided, and demanded of him, that he should restore Hefione to her brother Priamus; as it was unjust to detain so long in servitude a young woman of royal birth. Telamon answered, that he had done nothing to Priamus; and that he would not restore what he had received as a reward for his valour; and ordered Antenor to leave the island. Antenor went to Achaia; and sailing from thence to Castor and Pollux, demanded of them to satisfy Priamus, by restoring to him his sister Hefione. Castor and Pollux denied that they had done any injury to Priamus, but that Laomedon had first injured them; ordering Antenor to depart. From thence he sailed to Nestor in Pylus, telling him the cause of his coming; which when Nestor heard, he began to exclaim, how Antenor durst set his foot in Greece, seeing the Greeks were first injured by the Phrygians. When Antenor found that he had obtained nothing, and that Priamus was contumeliously treated, he went on shipboard, and returned home." The Roman histories before the time of Cicero are chronicles merely. Cato, Fabius, Pictor, and Piso, confined

finer themselves to naked facts (a). In the *Augustæ Historiæ scriptores* we find nothing but a jejune narrative of facts, commonly of very little moment, concerning a degenerate people, without a single incident that can rouse the imagination, or exercise the judgement. The monkish histories are all of them composed in the same manner.*

The dry narrative manner being very little interesting or agreeable, a taste for embellishment prompted some writers to be copious and verbose. Saxo Grammaticus, who in the 12th century composed in Latin a history of Denmark, surprisingly pure at that early period, is extremely verbose and full of tautologies. Such a style, at any rate unpleasant, is intolerable in a modern tongue, before it is enriched with a stock of phrases for expressing aptly the great variety of incidents that enter into history. Take the following example out of an endless number. Henry VII. of England, having the young Queen of Naples in view for a wife, deputed three men in character of ambassadors, to visit her, and to answer certain questions contained in curious and exquisite instructions for taking a survey of her person, complexion, &c. as expressed by Bacon in his life of that prince. One of the instructions was, to procure a picture of the Queen; which one would think could not re-

* Euripides, in his *Phœnicians*, introduces Oedipus, under sentence of banishment and blind, calling for his staff; his daughter Antigone putting it in his hand, and directing every step, to keep him from stumbling. Such minute circumstances, like what are frequent in Richardson's novels, tend indeed to make the reader conceive himself to be a spectator (b): but whether that advantage be not more than overbalanced by the languor of a creeping narrative, may be justly doubted.

(a) Cicero *De Oratore*, lib. 2. No 5.

(b) See *Elements of Criticism*, chap. 2. part 1. sect. 7.

quire many words; yet behold the instruction itself. "The King's said servants shall also, at their coming to the parties of Spayne, diligently enquire for some conyng paynter having good experience in making and paynting of visages and portretures, and suche oon they shall take with them to the place where the said Quunis make their abode, to the intent that the said paynter maye draw a picture of the visage and semblance of the said young Quine, as like unto her as it can or may be conveniently doon, which picture and image they shall substantially note, and marke in every pounte and circumstance, soo that it agree in similitude and likenesse as near as it may possible to the veray visage, countenance, and semblance of the said Quine; and in case they may perceyve that the paynter, at the first or second making thereof, hath not made the same perfaite to her similytude and likenesse, or that he hath omitted any feature or circumstance, either in colours, or other proporçons of the said visage, then they shall cause the same paynter, or some other the most conyng paynter that they can gete, soo oftentimes to renewe and reforme the same picture, till it be made perfaite, and agreeable in every behalfe, with the very image and visage of the said Quine *." After this specimen so much to his Lordship's taste, one will not be surprised at the flat-

The following passage, copied from an Edinburgh news-paper, may almost rival this eloquent piece. After observing that the frost was intense, which, says the writer, renders travelling very dangerous either in town or country, he proceeds thus. "We would therefore recommend it to shopkeepers, and those whose houses are close upon the streets or lanes, to scatter ashes opposite to their doors, as it may be a means of preventing passengers from falling, which they are in great danger of doing at present, from the slippiness of the streets, where that practice is not followed."

ness of the historical style during that period. By that flatness of style his Lordship's history of Henry VII. sinks below the gravity and dignity of history; particularly in his similes, metaphors, and allusions, not less distant than flat. Of Perkin Warbeck and his followers he says, "that they were now like sand without lime, ill bound together." Again, "But Perkin, advised to keep his fire, which hitherto burned as it were upon green wood, alive with continual blowing, sailed again into Ireland." Again, "As in the tides of people once up, there want not commonly stirring winds to make them more rough, so this people did light upon two ringleaders or captains." Again, speaking of the Cornish insurgents, and of the causes that inflamed them, "But now these bubbles by much stirring began to meet, as they used to do on the top of water." Again, speaking of Perkin, "And as it fareth with smoak, that never loseth itself till it be at the highest, he did now before his end raise his stile, intytling himself no more Richard Duke of York, but Richard the Fourth, King of England." He descends sometimes so low as to play upon words; witness the following speech made for Perkin to the King of Scotland. "High and mighty King! your Grace may be pleased benignly to bow your ears to hear the tragedy of a young man that by right ought to hold in his hand the ball of a kingdom, but by fortune is made himself a ball, tossed from misery to misery, and from place to place." The following is a strangely forc'd allusion. Talking of Margaret Duchess of Burgundy, who had patronized Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, he says, "It is the strangest thing in the world, that the Lady Margaret should now, when other women give over child-bearing, bring furth two such monsters, being, at birth, not of nine or ten months, but of many years. And whereas other natural mothers bring furth children weak, and not able to help themselves, she bringeth furth tall striplings, able, soon after

"after their coming into the world, to bid battle to mighty kings." I should not have given so many instances of puerilities in composition, were they not the performance of a great philosopher. Low indeed must have been the taste of that age when it infected its greatest genius.

The perfection of historical composition, which writers at last attain to after wandering through various imperfect modes, is a relation of interesting facts connected with their motives and consequences. A history of that kind is truly a chain of causes and effects. The history of Thucydides, and still more that of Tacitus, are shining instances of that mode.

A language in its original poverty, being deficient in strength and variety, has nothing at command for enforcing a thought but to redouble the expression. Instances are without number in the Old Testament. "And they say, How doth God know, and is there knowledge in the Most High?" Again, "Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell to the children of Israel." Again, "I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries." Again, "To know wisdom and instruction, to perceive the words of understanding, to receive the instructions of wisdom." "She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff." "Put away from thee a forward mouth, and perverse lips put far from thee. Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eye-lids look straight before thee."

Eloquence was of a later date than the art of literary composition; for till the latter was improved, there were no models for studying the former. Cicero's oration for Roscius is composed in a style diffuse and highly ornamented; which, says Plutarch, was universally approved, because at that time the style of Asia, introduced into Rome with its luxury, was in high vogue. But Cicero, in a journey to Greece, where he leisurely studied Greek au-

thors, was taught to prune off superfluities, and to purify his style, which he did to a high degree of refinement. He introduced into his native tongue a sweetness, a grace, a majesty, that surprised the world, and even the Romans themselves. Cicero observes with great regret, that if ambition for power had not drawn Julius Cæsar from the bar to command legions, he would have become the most complete orator in the world. So partial are men to the profession in which they excel. Eloquence triumphs in a popular assembly, makes some figure in a court of law composed of many judges; very little where there is but a single judge, and none at all in a despotic government. Eloquence flourished in the republics of Athens and of Rome; and makes some figure at present in a British house of Commons.

The Greek stage has been justly admired among all polite nations. The tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides in particular are by all critics held to be perfect in their kind, excellent models for imitation, but far above rivalry. If the Greek stage was so early brought to maturity, it is a phenomenon not a little singular in the progress of arts. The Greek tragedy made a rapid progress from Thespis to Sophocles and Euripides, whose compositions are indeed the most complete that ever were exhibited in Greece: but whether they be really such masterpieces as is generally thought, will admit some doubt. The subject is curious; and I hope the candid reader will give attention to what follows.

No human voice could fill the Greek theatre, which was so spacious as to contain several thousands without crowding. A brass pipe was invented to strengthen the voice; but that invention suppressed the melody of pronunciation, by confining the voice to a harsh monotony. The pipe was not the only unpleasant circumstance: every actor wore a mask; for what end or purpose, is not explained. It may be true, that the expressions of the countenance could not be distinctly seen by those who occupied the
back

back rows ; and a mask possibly was thought necessary in order to put all the citizens upon a level. But without prying into the cause, let us only figure an actor with a mask and a pipe. He may represent tolerably a simple incident or plain thought, such as are the materials of an Italian opera ; but the voice, countenance, and gestures, are indispensable in expressing refined sentiments, and the more delicate tones of passion.

Where then lies the charm in ancient tragedies that captivated all ranks of men ? Greek tragedies are more active than sentimental : they contain many sensible reflections on morals, manners, and upon life in general ; but no sentiments except what are plain and obvious. The subjects are of the simplest kind, such as give rise to the passions of hope, fear, love, hatred, envy, and revenge, in their most ordinary exertions : no intricate nor delicate situation to occasion any singular emotion ; no gradual swelling and subsiding of passion ; and seldom any conflict between different passions. I would not however be understood as meaning to depreciate Greek tragedies. They are indeed wonderful productions of genius, considering that the Greeks at that period were but beginning to emerge from roughness and barbarity into a taste for literature. The compositions of *Eschylus*, *Sophocles*, and *Euripides*, must have been highly relished among a people who had no idea of any thing more perfect. We judge by comparison, and every work is held to be perfect that has no rival. It ought at the same time to be kept in view, that it was not the dialogue which chiefly enchanted the Athenians, nor variety in the passions represented, nor perfection in the actors, but machinery and pompous decoration, joined with exquisite music. That these particulars were carried to the greatest height, we may with certainty conclude from the extravagant sums bestowed on them : the exhibiting a single tragedy was more expensive to the Athenians than their fleet or their army in any single campaign.

One would imagine, however, that these compositions were too simple to enchant for ever; as variety in action, sentiment, and passion is requisite, without which the stage will not continue long a favourite entertainment; and yet we find not a single improvement attempted after the days of Sophocles and Euripides. This may appear a matter of wonder at first view. But the wonder vanishes upon considering, that the manner of performance prevented absolutely any improvement. A fluctuation of passion and refined sentiments would have made no figure on the Grecian stage. Imagine the discording scene between Brutus and Cassius in Julius Cæsar to be there exhibited, or the handkerchief in the Moor of Venice: how slight would be their effect, when pronounced in a mask, and through a pipe? The workings of nature upon the countenance, and the flexions of voice expressive of various feelings, so deeply affecting in modern representation, would have been entirely lost. If a great genius had arisen with talents for composing a pathetic tragedy in perfection, he would have made no figure in Greece. An edifice must have been erected of a moderate size: new actors must have been trained to act with a bare face, and to pronounce in their own voice. And after all there remained a greater miracle still to be performed, viz. a total reformation of taste in the people of Athens. In one word, the simplicity of the Greek tragedy was suited to the manner of acting; and that manner excluded all improvements.

From these premises an inference may with certainty be drawn, that delicacy of taste and feeling were but faintly known among the Greeks, even when they made the greatest figure. Music indeed may be successfully employ'd in a sentimental tragedy; but pomp and splendor of performance avail nothing. A spectator deeply affected is regardless of decoration. I appeal to the reproving scene between Hamlet and the Queen his mother: does any man of taste bestow the slightest attention on the beauty of the scenery? It would

would however be rash to involve in the same censure every Athenian. Do not pantomime-show, rope-dancing, and other such fashionable spectacles, draw multitudes from the deepest tragedies? And yet among us there are persons of taste not a few, who despise such spectacles as fit only for the mob, persons who never bow'd the knee to Baal. And if there were such persons in Athens, of which we have no reason to doubt, it proves the superiority of their taste: they had no example of more refined compositions than were exhibited on their stage; we have many.

With respect to comedy, it does not appear that the Greek comedy surpassed the tragedy in its progress toward perfection. Horace mentions three stages of Greek comedy. The first was well suited to the rough and coarse manners of the Greeks, when Eupolis, Cratinus, and Aristophanes wrote. These authors were not ashamed to represent on the stage real persons, not even disguising their names; of which we have a striking instance in a comedy of Aristophanes called *The Clouds*, where Socrates is introduced, and most contemptuously treated. This sort of comedy, sparing neither gods nor men, was restrained by the magistrates of Athens, so far as to prohibit persons to be named on the stage. This led writers to do what is done at present: the characters and manners of known persons were painted so much to the life, that there could be no mistake; and the satire was indeed heightened by this regulation; as it was an additional pleasure to find out the names that were meant in the representation. This was termed the *middle comedy*. But as there still remained too great scope for obloquy and licentiousness, a law was made prohibiting real events or incidents to be introduced upon the stage. This law happily banished satire against individuals, and confined it to manners and customs in general. Obedient to this law are the comedies of Menander, Philemon, and Diphilus, who flourished about 300 years before the Christian era. And this is termed the *third stage* of

of Greek comedy. The comedies of Aristophanes, which still remain, err not less against taste than against decency. But we have good ground to believe, that the Greek comedy was considerably refined by Menander and his cotemporaries; and we must rely upon collateral evidence, because we have very few remains of their works. Their works however were far from perfection, if we can draw any conjecture from their imitator Plautus, who wrote about a century later. Plautus was a writer of genius; and it may be reasonably supposed that his copies did not fall much short of the originals, at least in matters that can be faithfully copied; and he shows very little art, either in his compositions, or in the conduct of his pieces. With respect to the former, his plots are wondrous simple, very little varied, and very little interesting. The subject of almost every piece is a young man in love with a music-girl, desiring to purchase her from the procurer, and employing a favourite slave to cheat his father out of the price; and the different ways of accomplishing the cheat, is all the variety we find. In some few of his comedies the story rises to a higher tone, the music-girl being discovered to be the daughter of a free man, which removes every obstruction to a marriage between her and her lover. In the conduct of his pieces there is a miserable defect of art. Instead of unfolding the subject in the progress of the action, as is done by Terence, and by every modern writer, Plautus introduces a person for no other end but to explain the story to the audience. In one of his comedies, a household-god is so obliging as not only to unfold the subject, but to relate beforehand every particular that is to be represented, not excepting the catastrophe. Did not Plautus know, that it is pleasant to have our curiosity raised about what will happen next? In the course of the action, persons are frequently introduced who are heard talking to themselves on the open street. One would imagine the Greeks to have been great babblers, when they could not refrain from liloquies

illoquies even in public. Could Plautus have been so artless in
 the conduct of his pieces, had a more perfect model been exhi-
 bited to him by Menander or the other authors mentioned?
 It is observed in Elements of Criticism (a), that when a lan-
 guage begins to receive some polish, and the meaning of words is
 tolerably ascertained, then it is that a play of words comes to be
 relished. At that period of the Roman language Plautus wrote.
 His wit consists almost entirely in a play of words, an eternal
 jingle, words brought together that have nearly the same sound,
 with different meanings, and words of different sounds that have
 the same meaning. As the Greek language had arrived to its per-
 fection many years before, such false wit may be justly ascribed
 to Plautus himself, not to the Greeks from whom he copied.
 What was the period of that bastard wit in Greece, I know not;
 but it appears not to have been antiquated in Homer's days, wit-
 nesses the joke in the Odyssy, where Ulysses imposed upon Poly-
 phemus by calling himself Houtis or No-man. Nor seems it to
 have been antiquated in the days of Euripides, who in his Cyclops
 repeats the same silly joke. The Roman genius soon purged their
 compositions of such infantine beauties; for in Terence, who
 wrote about fifty years later than Plautus, there is scarce a vestige
 of them. The dialogue beside of Terence is more natural and cor-
 rect, not a word but to the purpose: Plautus is full of tautologies,
 and digressions very little to the purpose. In a word, considering
 the slow progress of arts, the Roman theatre, from the time of Plautus
 to that of Terence, made as rapid a progress as perhaps ever hap-
 pened in any country. Aristotle defines comedy to be an imitation
 of light and trivial subjects provoking laughter. The comedies of

(a) Chapter 10.

VOL. I.

T

Plautus

Plautus correspond accurately to that definition: those of Terence rise to a higher tone.

Beside the disadvantages of the mask and pipe mentioned above, there are two causes that tended to keep back the Greek and Roman comedy from the perfection of its kind. The first is the slow progress of society among these nations, occasioned by debarring the female sex from it. Without a mixture of the two sexes society can never arrive at any degree of refinement, not to talk of perfection. That mixture brings to light every latent talent and every variety of character. To judge from ancient writers, man was a very plain being. Tacitus wrote when society between the sexes was abundantly free; and in no author before him is to be found any thing beyond the outlines of character. In ancient comedies there are misers, lovers, parasites, procurers; but the individuals of each class are cast in the same mould. In the *Rudens* of Plautus, it is true, a miser is painted with much anxiety about his hidden treasure, every trifling incident being converted by him into a cause of suspicion; but he is still the same miser that is painted by others, without any shade or singularity in the character. Homer is the only ancient that deserves to be excepted: his heroes have all courage; but courage in each is clearly of a different kind. Knowledge of an endless variety of character in the human species, acquired from unrestrained society, has enabled the moderns to enrich the theatre with new characters without end. What else is it but defect of knowledge in the dispositions of men that has confined Plautus and Terence, like the Italian comedy, to a very few characters?

Nothing is more evident than the superiority of Terence above Plautus in the art of writing; and considering that Terence is a later writer, nothing would appear more natural, if they did not copy the same originals. It may be owing to genius that Terence excell'd in purity of language, and propriety of dialogue; but how
account

account for his superiority over Plautus in the construction and conduct of a play? It will not certainly be thought, that Plautus would imitate the worst-constructed plays, leaving the best to those who should come after him. This difficulty has not occurred to any of the commentators, so far as I can recollect. Had the works of Menander and of his cotemperaries been preserved, they probably would have explained the mystery; which for want of that light will probably remain a mystery for ever.

Homer has for more than two thousand years been held the prince of poets. Such perfection in an author who flourished when arts were far short of maturity, is surprising, is miraculous. An author of genius (*a*) has endeavoured to account for this extraordinary phenomenon; and I willingly acknowledge, that he has exerted much industry, as well as invention; but in my apprehension without giving much satisfaction. The new light that is thrown above upon the Greek theatre has encouraged me to attempt a criticism on the Iliad, in order to judge whether Homer has so far anticipated the ordinary progress of nature as in a very early period to have arrived at the perfection of his art.

To form a good writer, genius and judgement must concur. Nature supplies the former; but to the latter instruction and imitation are essential. Shakespeare lived in an age that afforded him little opportunity to cultivate or improve his judgement; and tho' inimitable in every article that depends on genius, there are found many defects in the conduct of his plays, and in other particulars that require judgement ripen'd by experience. Homer lived in a rude age, little advanced in useful arts, and still less in civilization and enlarged benevolence. The nations engaged in the Trojan war are described by him as in a progress from the shepherd-state to that of agriculture. Frequent mention is made in the Iliad of the

(*a*) Essay on the life and writings of Homer.

most eminent men being shepherds. Andromaché in particular (a) mentions seven of her brethren who were slain by Achilles as they tended their father's flocks and herds. In that state, garments of woollen cloth were used; but the skins of beasts, the original clothing, were still worn as an upper garment: every chief in the Iliad appears in that dress. Such indeed was the simplicity of this early period, that a black ewe was promised by each chief to the man who would undertake to be a spy. In times of such simplicity, literature could not be far advanced; and it is a great doubt, whether there was at that time a single poem of the epic kind for Homer to imitate or improve upon. Homer is undoubtedly a wonderful genius, perhaps the greatest that ever existed: his fire, and the boldness of his conceptions, are inimitable. But in that early age it would fall little short of a real miracle, to find such ripeness of judgement, and correctness of execution, as in modern writers are the fruits of long experience, and progressive improvements, during the course of many centuries. Homer is far from being so ripe, or so correct. I shall mention but two or three particulars; for to dwell upon the imperfections of so eminent an author is not pleasant. The first is, that he reduces his heroes to be little better than puppets. Not one of them performs an action of éclat, but with the assistance of some deity: even Achilles himself is every where aided by superior powers. It is Jupiter who inspires Hector with boldness to perform the illustrious actions that are so finely described in the 15th book; and it is Jupiter who, changing sides, fills his heart with dismay. Glaucus, desperately wounded, supplicates Apollo, is miraculously healed, and returns to the battle perfectly sound. Hector, struck to the ground with a stone, and at the point of giving up the ghost, is cured by Apollo, and sent

(a) Book 6.

back to the battle with redoubled vigour. Homer resembles a sect of Christians, who hold, that a man can do nothing of himself, but that God does all. Can Homer's admirers be so blind as not to perceive, that this sort of machinery detracts from the dignity of his heroes, renders them less interesting, and less worthy of admiration? Homer however is deservedly such a favourite that we are prone to admit any excuse. In days of ignorance, people are much addicted to the marvellous. Homer himself, it may be justly supposed, was infected with that weakness; and he certainly knew that his hearers would be enchanted with every thing wonderful and out of the common course of nature. Another particular is his digressions without end, which draw our attention from the principal subject. I wish as good an apology could be made for them. Diomedes (a), for instance, meeting with Glaucus in the field of battle, and doubting from his majestic air whether he might not be an immortal, enquires who he was, declaring that he would not fight with a god. Glaucus lays hold of this very slight opportunity, in the very heat of action, to give a long history of his family. In the mean time the reader's patience is put to a trial, and his ardor cools. Agamemnon (b) desiring advice how to resist the Trojans, Diomedes springs forward; but before he offers advice, gives the history of all his progenitors, and of their characters, in a long train. And after all, what was the sage advice that required such a preface? It was, that Agamemnon should exhort the Greeks to fight bravely. At any rate, was Diomedes so little known as to make it proper to suspend the action at so critical a juncture for a genealogical history? There is a third particular which justly merits censure; and that is an endless number of mi-

(a) Book 6.

(b) Book 14.

nute circumstances, especially in the description of battles, where they are the most improper. One capital beauty of an epic poem is the selection of such incidents and circumstances as make a deep impression, keeping out of view every thing low or familiar (*a*). An account of a single battle employs the whole fifth book of the Iliad, and a great part of the sixth: yet in the whole there is no general action; but unknown warriors, whom we never heard of before, killed at a distance with an arrow or a javelin; and every wound described with anatomical accuracy. The whole seventeenth book is employ'd in the contest about the dead body of Patroclus, stuffed with minute circumstances below the dignity of an epic poem. In such scenes the reader is fatigued with endless particulars; and has nothing to support him but the melody of Homer's versification. Gratitude would prompt one to apologise for an author who affords so much pleasure: the only apology I can think of for the particulars last mentioned is, that Homer had no good models to copy after; and that without good models it is in vain to expect maturity of judgement. In a word, Homer was a blazing star, and the more to be admired because he blazed in an obscure age. But that he should in no degree be tainted with the imperfections of such an age is a wild thought: it is scarce possible, but by supposing him to be more than man.

Particular causes that advance the progress of fine arts, as well as of useful arts, are mentioned in the first part of this Sketch, and to these I refer.

Having traced the progress of the fine arts toward maturity in a summary way, the decline of these arts comes next in order. An art, in its progress toward maturity, is greatly promoted by emulation; and after arriving at maturity, its downfall is not less

(*a*) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 232. edit. 5.

promoted by it. It is difficult to judge of perfection but by comparison; and an artist, ambitious to outstrip his predecessors, cannot submit to be an imitator, but must strike out something new, which in an art advanced to ripeness, seldom fails to be a degeneracy. This cause of the decline of the fine arts, I shall endeavour to illustrate by various instances. The perfection of vocal music is to accompany passion, and to enforce sentiment. In ancient Greece the province of music was well understood; which being confined within its proper sphere, had an enchanting influence. Harmony at that time was very little cultivated, because it was of very little use: melody reaches the heart, and it is by it chiefly that a sentiment is enforced, or a passion sooth'd: harmony on the contrary reaches the ear only; and it is a matter of undoubted experience, that the most melodious airs admit but of very simple harmony. Artists in later times, ignorant why harmony was so little regarded by the ancients, apply'd themselves seriously to its cultivation; and they have been wonderfully successful. But they have been successful at the expence of melody; which in modern compositions, generally speaking, is lost amid the blaze of harmony. These compositions tickle the ear by the luxury of complicated sounds, but make seldom any impression on the heart. The Italian opera in its form resembles the Greek tragedy, from which it is evidently copied; but very little in substance. In the latter, music being made subservient to sentiment, the dialogue is nervous and sublime: in the former, the whole weight is laid on music, and the dialogue, devoid of sentiment, is weak and spiritless. Restless man knows no golden mean, but will be attempting innovations without end *. By the same ambition,

* Corelli excels all the other moderns in combining harmony with melody. His melody could not be richer without impoverishing the harmony; and his harmony could

bition, architecture has visibly declined from its perfection. The Ionic was the favourite order when architecture was in its height of glory. The Corinthian order came next; which, in attempting greater perfection, has deviated from the true simplicity of nature; and the deviation is still greater in the Composite order (a). With respect to literary productions, the first essays of the Romans were very imperfect. We may judge of this from Plautus, whose compositions are abundantly rude, tho' much admired by his cotemporaries, being the best that existed at that time. The exalted spirit of the Romans hurried them on to the grand and beautiful; and literary productions of all kinds were in perfection when Augustus reigned. In attempting still greater perfection, the Roman compositions became a strange jumble of inconsistent parts; they were tumid and pompous, and at the same time full of antitheses, conceit, and tinsel wit. Every thing new in the fine arts pleases, tho' less perfect than what we are accustomed to; and for that reason such compositions were generally relished. We see not by what gradual steps writers after the time of Augustus deviated from the patterns that were before them; for no book of any moment after that time is preserved till we come down to Seneca, in whose works nature and simplicity give place to artificial thought and bastard wit. He was a great corrupter of the Roman taste; and after him nothing was relished but brilliant strokes of fancy, with very little regard to sentiment: even Virgil and Cicero made no figure in comparison. Lucan has a forc'd elevation of thought and style, very difficult to

could not be richer without impoverishing the melody. And therefore if harmony is requisite in any considerable degree, the productions of that author may be pronounced perfect,

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 206. edit. 5.

be supported; and accordingly he sinks often into puerile reflections; witness his encomium on the river Po, which, says he, would equal the Danube, had it the same number of tributary streams. Quintilian, a writer of true and classical taste, who was protected and encouraged by Vespasian, attempted to stem the tide of false writing. His rhetoric is composed in an elegant style; and his observations contain every delicacy of the critical art. At the same time flourished Tacitus, possessing a more extensive knowledge of the nature of man than any other author ancient or modern, if Shakespeare be not excepted. His style is original, concise, compact, and comprehensive; and in what is properly called his history, perfectly correct and beautiful. He has been imitated by several, but never equalled by any. Brutus is said to be the last of the Romans for love of liberty: Quintilian and Tacitus may be said to be the last of the Romans for literary genius. Pliny the younger is no exception: his style is affected, turgid, and full of childish brilliancy. Seneca and Pliny are proper examples of writers who study show more than substance, and who make sense yield to sound. The difference between these authors and those of the Augustan age resembles the difference between Greek and Italian music. Music among the Greeks limited itself to the employment to which it is destin'd by nature, viz. to be the handmaid of sense, to enforce, enliven, or sweeten, a sentiment. In the Italian opera the mistress is degraded to be the handmaid; and harmony triumphs, with very little regard to sentiment.

Another great cause that precipitates the downfall of every fine art is despotism. The reason is obvious; and there is a dismal example of it in Rome, particularly with regard to eloquence. We learn from a dialogue accounting for the corruption of the Roman eloquence, that in the decline of the art it became fashionable to stuff harangues with impertinent poetical quotations, without any view but ornament merely; and this also was long fashionable in

France. It happened unluckily for the Romans, and for the world, that the fine arts were at their height in Rome, and not much upon the decline in Greece, when despotism put an end to the republic. Augustus, it is true, retarded their fall, particularly that of literature; it being the politic of his reign to hide despotism, and to give his government an air of freedom. His court was a school of urbanity, where people of genius acquired that delicacy of taste, that elevation of sentiment, and that purity of expression, which characterize the writers of his time. He honoured men of learning, admitted them to his table, and was bountiful to them. It would be painful to follow the decline of the fine arts in Rome to their total extirpation. The tyranny of Tiberius, and of subsequent emperors, broke at last the elevated and independent spirit of the brave Romans, reduced them to abject slavery, and left not a spark of genius *. The science of law is the only exception, as it flourished even in the worst of times: the Roman lawyers were a respectable body, and less the object of jealousy than men of power and extensive landed property. Among the Greeks also, a conquered people, the fine arts decay'd; but not so rapidly as at Rome;

* A singular persecution was carried on by Pope Gregory, most improperly surnamed the Great, against the works of Cicero, Titus Livius, and Cornelius Tacitus, which in every corner of Christendom were publicly burnt; and from that time there has not been seen a complete copy of any of these authors. This happen'd in the sixth century: so soon had the Romans fallen, from the perfection of taste and knowledge, to the most humbling barbarity. Nor was that the only persecution of books on the score of religion. Many centuries before, a similar instance happened in China, directed by a foolish emperor. The Alexandrian library was twice consumed by fire, once in the time of Julius Cæsar, and once in the time of the Calif Omar. What a profusion of knowledge was lost past redemption! And yet, upon the whole, it seems doubtful, whether the moderns have suffered by these events. At what corner of a library shall a man begin where he sees an infinity of books, choice ones too? Even the most resolute would be deterred from reading at all.

the

the Greeks, farther removed from the seat of government, being less within the reach of a Roman tyrant. During their depression they were guilty of the most puerile conceits; witness verses composed in the form of an axe, an egg, wings, and such like. The style of Greek authors in the reign of the Emperor Hadrian is unequal, obscure, stiff, and affected. Lucian is the only exception I am acquainted with.

We need scarce any other cause but despotism to account for the decline of statuary and painting in Greece. These arts had arrived at their utmost perfection about the time of Alexander the Great; and from that time they declined gradually with the vigour of a free people; for Greece was now enslaved by the Macedonian power. It may in general be observed, that when a nation becomes stationary in that degree of power which it acquires from its constitution and situation, the national spirit subsides, and men of talents become rare. It is still worse with a nation that is sunk below its former power and pre-eminence; and worst of all when it is reduced to slavery. Other causes concurred to accelerate the downfall of the arts mentioned. Greece in the days of Alexander was filled with statues of excellent workmanship; and there being little demand for more, the later statuary were reduced to heads and busts. At last the Romans put a total end both to statuary and painting in Greece, by plundering it of its finest pieces; and the Greeks, exposed to the avarice of the conquerors, bestow'd no longer any money on the fine arts. Winckelman, overlooking the causes mentioned, borrows from Velleius Paterculus a reason for the decline of the fine arts in Greece, not a little ridiculous. "Naturaque, quod summo studio petatum est, ascendit in summum; difficilisque in perfecto mora est; naturaliterque, quod procedere non potest, recedit (a)." "The idea (says Winckelman) of

(a) Roman History, lib. 1.

“beauty could not be made more perfect; and those arts which
 “could not advance farther, become retrograde, by a fatality at-
 “tending all human things, viz. that if they cannot mount, they
 “must fall down, because stability is not a quality of any created
 “thing.”

The decline of the fine arts in Rome is by a writer of taste and elegance ascribed to a cause different from any above mentioned, a cause that overwhelms manhood as well as the fine arts where-ever it prevails; and that is opulence, joined with its faithful attendants avarice and luxury. It would be doing injustice to that author to refuse him in his native language. “Priscis temporibus, quum ad-
 “huc nuda virtus placeret, vigeabant artes ingenuæ; summumque
 “certamen inter homines erat, ne quid profuturum seculis diu la-
 “teret. Itaque, Hercules! omnium herbarum succos Democri-
 “tus expressit: et ne lapidum virgultorumque vis lateret, ætatem
 “inter experimenta consumpsit. Eudoxus quidem in cacumine
 “excelsissimi montis consenuit, ut astrorum cœlique motus de-
 “prehenderet: et Chrysippus, ut ad inventionem sufficeret, ter
 “helleboro animum deterfit. Verum ut ad plastas converterar,
 “Lysippum statuæ unius lineamentis inhærentem inopia extinxit:
 “et Myron, qui penè hominum animas ferarumque ære compre-
 “henderat, non invenit heredem. At nos, vino scortisque demersi,
 “ne paratas quidem artes audemus cognoscere; sed accusatores
 “antiquitatis, vitia tantum docemus, et discimus. Ubi est dia-
 “lectica? ubi astronomia? ubi sapientiæ consultissima via?
 “Quis unquam venit in templum, et votum fecit si ad eloquen-
 “tiam pervenisset? quis, si philosophiæ fontem invenisset? Ac
 “ne bonam quidem mentem, aut bonam valetudinem petunt:
 “sed statim, antequam limen capitolii tangunt, alius donum pro-
 “mittit si propinquum divitem extulerit; alius, si thesaurum ef-
 “foderit; alius, si ad trecenties H—S. salvus pervenerit. Ipse
 “senatus, recti bonique præceptor, mille pondo auri capitolio
 “promittere

"promittere solet : et ne quis dubitet pecuniam concupiscere, Jo-
 "vem quoque peculio exorat. Nolito ergo mirari, si pictura de-
 "fecit, quum omnibus diis hominibusque formosior videatur
 "massa auri, quam quidquid Apelles Phidiasve fecerunt * (a)."

In England, the fine arts are far from such perfection as to suffer
 by opulence. They are in a progress, it is true, toward matu-

* "In ancient times, when naked virtue had her admirers, the liberal arts were
 "in their highest vigour ; and there was a generous contest among men, that no-
 "thing of real and permanent advantage should long remain undiscovered. De-
 "mocritus extracted the juice of every herb and plant, and left the virtue of a
 "single stone or twig should escape him, he consumed a lifetime in experiments.
 "Eudoxus, immersed in the study of astronomy, spent his age upon the top of a
 "mountain. Chrysippus, to stimulate his inventive faculty, thrice purified his ge-
 "nius with hellebore. To turn to the imitative arts : Lysippus, while labouring
 "on the forms of a single statue, perished from want. Myron, whose powerful
 "hand gave to the brass almost the soul of man, and animals, — at his death
 "found not an heir ! Of us of modern times what shall we say ? Immersed in
 "drunkenness and debauchery, we want the spirit to cultivate those arts which we
 "possess. We inveigh against the manners of antiquity ; we study vice alone ;
 "and vice is all we teach. Where now is the art of reasoning ? where astronomy ?
 "where is the right path of wisdom ? What man now-a-days is heard in our
 "temples to make a vow for the attainment of eloquence, or for the discovery of
 "the fountain of true philosophy ? Nor do we even pray for health of body, or
 "a sound understanding. One, while he has scarce entered the porch of the
 "temple, devotes a gift in the event of the death of a rich relation ; another prays
 "for the discovery of a treasure ; a third for a ministerial fortune. The senate
 "itself, the exemplary preceptor of what is good and laudable, has promised a
 "thousand pounds of gold to the capitol ; and, to remove all reproach from the
 "crime of avarice, has offered a bribe to Jupiter himself. How should we won-
 "der that the art of painting has declined, when, in the eyes both of the gods
 "and men, there is more beauty in a mass of gold, than in all the works of Phidias
 "and Apelles ?"

(a) Petronius Arbitr.

rity ;

rity; but, gardening alone excepted, they proceed in a very slow pace.

There is a particular cause that never fails to undermine a fine art in a country where it is brought to perfection, abstracting from every one of the causes above mentioned. In the first part of the present sketch it is remarked, that nothing is more fatal to an art or to a science than a performance so much superior to all of the kind as to extinguish emulation. This remark is exemplified in the great Newton, who, having surpassed all the ancients, has not left to his countrymen even the faintest hope of rivalling him; and to that cause is attributed the visible decline of mathematics in Great Britain. The same cause would have been fatal to the arts of statuary and painting among the Greeks, even tho' they had continued a free people. The decay of painting in modern Italy is probably owing to the same cause: Michael Angelo, Raphael, Titian, &c. are lofty oaks that bear down young plants in their neighbourhood, and intercept from them the sunshine of emulation. Had the art of painting made a slower progress in Italy, it might have there continued in vigour to this day. Velleius Paterculus says judiciously, "*Ut primo ad consequendos quos priores ducimus accendimur; ita, ubi aut præteriri aut æquari eos posse desperavimus, studium cum spe senescit; et quod adsequi non potest, sequi definit: præteritoque eo in quo eminere non possumus, aliquid in quo nitamur conquerimus.**"

The decline of an art or science proceeding from the foregoing cause, is the most rapid where a strict comparison can be instituted

* "As at first we are excited to emulate those superior models, so when once we have lost the hope of excelling, or even of equalling them, our ambition fails us with our hopes: we cease to pursue what we cannot attain, and neglecting that study in which we are debarred from arriving at excellence, we search for a different field of emulation."

between

between the works of different masters. The superiority of Newton above every other mathematician can be ascertained with precision; and hence the sudden decline of that science in Great Britain. In Italy a talent for painting continued many years in vigour, because no painter appeared with such superiority of genius as to carry perfection into every branch of the art. As one surpassed in designing, one in colouring, one in graceful attitudes, there was still scope for emulation. But when at last there was not a single perfection but what one or other master had excelled in, from that period the art began to languish. Architecture continued longer in vigour than painting, because the principles of comparison in the former are less precise than in the latter. The artist who could not rival his predecessors in an established mode, sought out a new mode for himself, which, tho' perhaps less elegant or perfect, was for a time supported by novelty.

Corruption of the Latin tongue makes a proper appendix to the decline of the fine arts in Rome. That the Latin tongue did not long continue in purity after the Emperor Augustus, is certain; and all writers agree, that the cause of its early corruption was a continual influx into Rome of men to whom the Latin was a foreign language. The reason is plausible; but whether solid may justly be doubted. In all countries there are provincial dialects; which however tend not to corrupt the language of the capital, because they are carefully avoided by all who pretend to speak properly; and accordingly the multitude of provincials who flock to Paris and London have no effect to debase the language. The same probably was the case in old Rome, especially with respect to strangers whose native tongue was totally different from that of Rome: their imperfect manner of speaking Latin might be excused, but certainly was not imitated. Slaves in Rome had little conversation with their masters, except in receiving orders or reproof; which had no tendency to vitiate the Latin tongue. The

corruption

corruption of that tongue, and at last its death and burial as a living language, were the result of two combined causes; of which the early prevalence of the Greek language in Rome is the first. Latin was native to the Romans only, and to the inhabitants of Latium. The languages of the rest of Italy were numerous: the Messapian was the mother-tongue in Apulia, the Etruscan in Tuscany and Umbria, the Greek in Magna Græcia, the Celtic in Lombardy and Liguria, &c. &c. Latin had arrived at its purity not many years before the reign of Augustus; and had not taken deep root in those parts of Italy where it was not the mother-tongue, when Greek came to be the fashionable language among people of rank, as French is in Europe at present. Greek, the storehouse of learning, prevailed in Rome, even in Cicero's time; of which he himself bears testimony in his oration for the poet Archias. "*Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus: Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur.*" And for that reason Atticus is warmly solicited by him to write the history of his consulship in Greek. Thus Latin, jostled by Greek out of its place, was left to inferiors; and probably would have sunk to utter oblivion, even though the republic had continued in vigour. But the chief cause was the despotism of the Roman government, which proved the destruction of the fine arts, and of literature in particular. In a country of so many different languages the Latin tongue could not be preserved in purity, but by a constant perusal of Roman classics: but these were left to rot in libraries, a dark cloud of ignorance having overspread the whole empire. Every person carelessly spoke the language acquired in the nursery; and people of different tongues being mixed under one government, without a common standard, fell gradually into a sort of mixed language, which every one made a shift to understand. The irruption of many barbarous nations into Italy, several of whom settled there, added to the jargon. And that jargon, composed of many heterogeneous

rogeneous parts, was in process of time purified to the tongue that is now native to all the inhabitants of Italy.

In a history of the Latin tongue, it ought not to be overlooked, that it continued long in purity among the Roman lawyers. The science of law was in Rome more cultivated than in any other country. The books writ upon that science in Latin were numerous; and, being highly regarded, were the constant study of every man who aspired to be an eminent lawyer. Neither could such men have any bias to the Greek tongue, as law was little cultivated in Greece. Thus it happened, that the Latin tongue, so far as concerns law, was preserved in purity, even to the time of the Emperor Justinian.

Greek was preserved in purity much longer than Latin. The same language was spoken through all Greece, with some slight varieties in dialect. It was brought to great perfection and firmly rooted during the prosperous days of Greece. Its classics were numerous, and the study of every person who pretended to literature*. Now tho' the free and manly spirit of the Greeks yielded to Roman despotism, yet while any appetite for literature remained, their invaluable classics were a standard, which preserved the language in purity. But ignorance at length became universal, and the Greek classics ceased to be a standard, being buried in libraries, as the Roman classics had been for centuries. In that state, the Greek tongue could not fail to degenerate, among an ignorant and servile people, who had no longer any ambition to act well, write well, or speak well. And yet after all, that beautiful tongue, far beyond a rival, has suffered less alteration than any other ever did in similar circumstances; one cause of which is, that to

* There still remain about three thousand Greek books: of Latin books not above sixty.

this day the Greeks live separate from their masters the Turks, and have little commerce with them.

From the fate of the Latin tongue, an observation is drawn by many writers, that all languages are in a continual flux, changing from age to age without end. And such as are fond of fame, deplore it as a heavy misfortune, that the language in which they write will soon become obsolete and unintelligible. But it is a common error in reasoning, to found a general conclusion upon a single fact. In its progress toward perfection, a language is continually improving, and therefore continually changing. But supposing a language to have acquired its utmost perfection, I see nothing that should necessarily occasion any change: on the contrary, the classical books in that language become a standard for writing and speaking, to which every man of taste and figure conforms himself. Such was the case of the Greek tongue, till that people were brutified by despotism: the Italian has continued in perfection more than three centuries, and the French more than one. The English language has not yet acquired all the purity it is susceptible of: but when there is no place for further improvements, there seems little doubt of its becoming stationary, like the languages now mentioned. I bar always such a revolution, as eradicates knowledge, and reduces a people to a state of barbarity. In an event so dismal, the destruction of classical books, and of a pure language, will not be the chief calamity: they will be little regretted in the universal wreck. In the mean time, to a writer of genius in a polished nation it cannot but be a charming prospect, that his works will stand and fall with his country. To make such a writer exert his talents for purifying his mother-tongue, and for adding to the number and reputation of its classics, what nobler encitement, than the certainty of being transmitted to posterity, and welcomed by every person of taste through all ages!

As before the invention of printing writers could have nothing
in

in view but reputation and praise, they endeavoured to give the utmost perfection to their compositions. They at the same time studied brevity, in order that their works might be diffused through many hands; for the expence of transcribing great volumes could not be afforded by every reader. The art of printing has made a great change: the opportunity it furnishes to multiply copies has degraded writing to be a lucrative employment. Authors now study to swell their works, in order to swell the price; and being in a hurry for money, they neglect the precept of Horace, *Nonum prematur in annum*. Take for example the natural history of Aldrovandus, in many folio volumes. After filling his common-place book with passages from every author ancient and modern, to the purpose and not to the purpose, he sits down to compose, bent to transfuse into his book every article thus painfully collected. For example, when he introduces the ox, the cock, or any other animal; far from confining himself to its natural history, he omits nothing that has been said of it in books where it has been occasionally introduced, not even excepting tales for amusing children: he mentions all the superstitious notions concerning it, every poetical comparison drawn from it, the use it has served in hieroglyphics and in coats-armorial; in a word, all the histories and all the fables in which it has been named. Take another instance from a German or Dutch chronologer, whose name has escaped me, and which I give in a translation from the Latin, to prevent the bias that one has for a learned language. "Samson was the same with the Theban Hercules; which appears from the actions attributed to each of them, especially from the following, That Hercules, unarmed, is said to have suffocated the Nemean lion with a squeeze of his arms: Samson unarmed did the same, by tearing a lion to pieces; and Josephus says, that he did not tear the lion, but put out his breath with a squeeze; which could be done, and was done by Scu-

" tileus the wrestler, as reported by Suidas. David also, unarmed,
 " tore to pieces a lion, 1 Samuel, chap. 17.; and Benaiah the son
 " of Jehojada also slew a lion, 2 Samuel, chap. 23. ver. 20. More-
 " over we read, that Samson having caught three hundred foxes,
 " tied lighted firebrands to their tails, and drove them into the
 " standing corn of the Philistines, by which both the shocks and
 " standing corn, with the vineyards and olives, were burnt up.
 " Many think it incredible, that three hundred foxes should be
 " caught by one man; as the fox, being the most cunning of all
 " animals, would not suffer itself to be easily taken. Accord-
 " ingly Oppian, a Greek poet who writes upon hunting, asserts, that
 " no fox will suffer itself to be taken in a gin or a net; tho' we are
 " taught the contrary by Martial, lib. 10. epig. 37.

" *Hic olidum clamofus ages in retia vulpem.*

" In India, eagles, hawks, and ravens, are taught to hunt foxes,
 " as we are informed by Olianus, Var. hist. lib. 9: cap. 26. They
 " are also caught by traps and snares, and in covered pits, as
 " wolves are, and other large animals. Nor is it wonderful that
 " such a multitude of foxes were caught by Samson, considering
 " that Palestine abounded with foxes. He had hunters without
 " number at command; and he was not confined in time. The
 " fame of that exploit was spread far and near. Even among the
 " Romans there were vestiges of it, as appears from Ovid, Fast.
 " lib. 9. ver. 681. In one Roman festival, armed foxes were let
 " loose in the circus; which Ovid, in the place quoted, says, was
 " done in memory of the Carfiolan fox, which, having destroy'd
 " many hens belonging to a country-woman, was caught by her,
 " and punished as follows. She wrapped up the fox in hay, which
 " she set fire to; and the fox being let go, fled through the stand-
 " ing corn, and set it on fire. There can be no doubt but that
 " this

"this festival was a vestige of Samson's foxes, not only from congruity of circumstances, but from the time of celebration, which was the month of April, the time of harvest in Palestine. See more about foxes in Burman's works." Not to mention the ridiculous arguments of this writer to prove Samson to be the same with the Theban Hercules, nor the childish wanderings from that subject, every one must be sensible of his having overlooked the chief difficulty. However well fixed the fire-brands might be, it is not easily conceivable, that the foxes, who would naturally fly to their lurking-holes, could much injure the corn, or the olive trees. And it is as little conceivable, what should have moved Samson to employ foxes, when, by our author's supposition, he had men at command, much better qualified than foxes for committing waste. This author would have saved himself much idle labour had he embraced a very probable opinion, that if the translation be not erroneous, the original text must be corrupted. But enough, and more than enough, of these writers. Maturity of taste has banished such absurdities; and at present, happily, books are less bulky, and more to the purpose, than formerly.

It is observed above (a), that in a country thinly peopled, where the same person must for bread undertake different employments, the people are knowing and conversable; but stupid and ignorant in a populous country, where industry and manufactures abound. That observation holds, not with respect to the fine arts. It requires so much genius to copy even a single figure, whether in painting or in sculpture, as to prevent the operator from degenerating into a brute. The great exertion of genius, as well as of invention, required in grouping figures, and in imitating human

(a) First section of the present Sketch.

actions,

actions, tends to invigorate those faculties with respect to every subject, and of course to form a man of parts.

Such sketches of the history of man as tend the most to explain his nature, are chiefly insisted on in this work. The history of music is entertaining, that branch especially which compares ancient and modern music; and accordingly I have occasionally handled that branch above. The other branches fall not properly within my plan; because they seem to afford little opening into human nature. There is one article however, which regard to my native country will not suffer me to omit. We have in Scotland a multitude of songs tender and pathetic, expressive of love in its varieties of hope, fear, success, despondence, and despair. The style of the music is wild and irregular, extremely pleasant to the natives, but little relished by the bulk of those who are accustomed to the regularity of the Italian style. None but men of genius, who study nature, and break loose from the thralldom of custom, esteem that music. It was a favourite of the late Geminiani, whose compositions show no less delicacy of taste than superiority of genius, and it is warmly praised by Alessandro Tassoni, the celebrated author of *Secchia Rapita*. Discourfing of ancient and modern music, and quoting from various authors the wonderful effects produced by some modern compositions, he subjoins the following passage. "Noi ancora possiamo connumerar trà nostri, " Jacopo Rè de Scozia, che non pur cose sacre compose in canto, " ma trovò da se stesso una nuova musica lamentevole e mesta, " differente da tutte l'altre. Nel che poi è stato imitato da Carlo " Gesualdo Principe di Venosa, che in questa nostra età ha illustrata anch' egli la musica con nuova mirabili invenzioni (a) *."

The

(a) *Pensieri diversi*, lib. 10. cap. 23.

* "We may reckon among the composers of the moderns, James King of Scotland, who not only composed sacred songs, but was himself the inventor of

" a

The king mentioned must be James I. of Scotland, the only one of our kings who seems to have had any remarkable taste in the fine arts; and the music can be no other than the songs mentioned above. These are commonly thought to be the composition of David Rizzio, because he was an Italian and a musician; but erroneously, as we now discover from Tassoni. That King was eminent for poetry no less than for music. He is praised for the former by Bishop Leslie, one of our historians, in the following words: "Patrii carminis gloria nulli secundus." We have many poems ascribed by tradition to that king; one in particular, *Christ's Kirk on the Green*, is a ludicrous poem, describing low manners with no less propriety than sprightliness.

Useful arts will never be neglected in a country where there is any police; for every man finds his account in them. Fine arts are more precarious. They are not relished but by persons of taste, who are rare; and such as can spare great sums for supporting them, are still more rare. For that reason they will never flourish in any country, unless patronized by the sovereign, or by men of power and opulence. They merit such patronage as one of the springs of government; and a capital spring they make, by multiplying amusements, and humanizing manners; upon which account they have always been encouraged by good princes.

"a new style of music, plaintive and pathetic, different from all others. In this manner of composition he has been imitated in our times by Carlo Gesualdo Prince of Venosa, who has illustrated that style of music with new and wonderful invention."

SKETCH

"We may reckon among the composers of the moderns James King of Scotland, who not only composed sacred songs, but was himself the inventor of

S K E T C H VI.

Progress of the FEMALE SEX.

THE history of the female sex, a capital branch of the history of man, comprehends great variety of matter, curious and interesting. But sketches are my province, not complete histories; and I propose in the present sketch to trace the gradual progress of women, from their low state in savage tribes, to their elevated state in civilized nations.

With regard to the outlines, whether of internal disposition, or of external figure, men and women are precisely the same. Nature, however, intending them for mates, has given them characters different, but concordant, so as to produce together delicious harmony. The man, naturally more robust, is fitted for severe labour and for field-exercises; the woman for sedentary occupations; and particularly for nursing children. To that difference the mind also contributes. A boy is always running about; delights in a top or a ball; and rides upon a stick for want of a horse. A girl has less inclination to move; her first amusement is a baby; which she delights to dress and undress. The man, bold and vigorous, is qualified for being a protector: the woman, delicate and timid, requires protection. The man, as a protector, is directed by nature to govern: the woman, conscious of inferiority, is disposed to obedience. Their intellectual powers correspond to the destination of nature: men have penetration and solid judgement to fit them for governing:

governing : women have sufficient understanding to make a decent figure under good government ; a greater proportion would excite dangerous rivalry. Add another capital difference of character : the gentle and insinuating manners of the female sex tend to soften the roughness of the other sex ; and where-ever women are indulged with any freedom, they polish sooner than men.

These are not the only particulars that distinguish the sexes. With respect to matrimony, it is the privilege of the male, as superior and protector, to make a choice : the female preferred has no privilege but barely to consent or to refuse. Nature fits them for these different parts : the male is bold, the female bashful. Hence among all nations it is the practice for men to court, and for women to be courted : which holds also among many other animals, probably among all that pair.

Another distinction is equally visible : The master of a family is immediately connected with his country : his wife, his children, his servants, are immediately connected with him, and with their country through him only. Women accordingly have less patriotism than men ; and less bitterness against the enemies of their country.

The peculiar modesty of the female sex is also a distinguishing circumstance. Nature hath provided them with it as their chief defence against the artful solicitations of the other sex before marriage, and also as the chief support of conjugal fidelity. It is held to be their capital virtue ; and a woman who surrenders her chastity is universally despised ; tho' in a man chastity is scarce held to be a virtue, except in the married state. But of that more fully afterwards.

A fundamental article in the present sketch is matrimony ; and it has been much controverted, whether it be an appointment of nature, or only of municipal law. Many writers have exercised their talents in that controversy, but without giving any satis-

faction to a judicious enquirer. If I mistake not, it may be determined upon solid principles; and as it is of importance in the history of man, the reader, I am hopeful, will not be disgusted at the length of the argument.

Many writers hold, that women were originally common; that animal love was gratified as among horses and horned cattle; and that matrimony was not known till nations grew in some degree to be orderly and refined. I select Cicero as an author of authority: "Nam fuit quoddam tempus, cum in agris homines pascim, bestiarum more, vagabantur, et sibi victu ferino vitam propagabant: nec ratione animi quicquam sed pleraque viribus corporis administrabant. Nondum divinæ religionis non humani officii ratio colebatur. Nemo legitimas viderat nuptias, non certos quisquam inspexerat liberos * (a)." Pliny, in support of that doctrine, informs us, that the Garamantes, an African nation, lived promiscuously together, without any notion of matrimony. Among the Aufes, a people of Libya, as Herodotus says, matrimony was not known, and men cohabited with women indifferently, like other animals. A boy educated by his mother was at a certain age admitted to an assembly of the men, and the man he clung to was reputed his father. Justin and other authors report, that before Cecrops, who reigned in Attica about 1600 years before Christ, marriage was not known in Greece; and that the burden of children lay upon the mother.

* "For there was a time, when men, like the brutes, roamed abroad over the earth, and fed like wild beasts upon other animals. Then reason bore no sway, but all was ruled by superior strength. The ties of religion, and the obligations of morality, were then unfelt. Lawful marriage was unknown, and no father was certain of his offspring."

(a) De Inventione, lib. 1.

Before

Before entering directly into the matter, it is proper to remove, if possible, the bias of these great names. The practice of the Garamantes and of the Aufes is mentioned by Pliny and Herodotus as singular; and were it better vouched than it is, it would avail very little against the practice of all other nations. Little weight can be laid upon Pliny's evidence in particular, considering what he reports in the same chapter of the Blemmyans, that they had no head, and that the mouth and eyes were in the breast. Pliny at the same time, as well as Herodotus, being very deficient in natural knowledge, were grossly credulous; and cannot be rely'd on with respect to any thing strange or uncommon. As to what is reported of ancient Greece, Cecrops possibly prohibited polygamy, or introduced some other matrimonial regulation, which by writers might be mistaken for a law appointing matrimony. However that be, one part of the report is undoubtedly false; for it will be made evident afterward, that in the hunter-state, or even in that of shepherds, it is impracticable for any woman, by her own industry alone, to rear a numerous issue. If this be at all possible, it can only be in the torrid zone, where people live on fruits and roots, which are produced in plenty with very little labour. Upon that account Diodorus Siculus is less blameable for listening to a report, that the inhabitants of Taprobana, supposed to be the island of Ceylon, never marry, but that women are used promiscuously. But as there is no such practice known at present in the East Indies, there is no just ground to believe, that it ever was the practice; and the East Indies were so little known to the ancient Greeks, that their authors cannot be much rely'd on in the accounts they give of that distant region. The opinion of Cicero may seem to have more weight at first view; and yet a single observation will reduce it to nothing. The notions of that author upon the primitive state of man must confessedly be exceedingly crude, when he denies to savages any sense of religion or of moral

duty. Ought we to rely more on him, when he denies, that they have any notion of matrimony? Cæsar's account of the ancient Britons approaches the nearest to a loose commerce with women; tho' in the main it is good evidence against the opinion of Cicero: It was common, he says, for a number of brothers, or other near relations, to use their wives promiscuously. The offspring however were not common; for each man maintained the children that were produced by his own wife. Herodotus reports the same of the Massagetæ.

Laying thus aside the great names of Cicero, Herodotus, and Pliny, the field lies open to a fair and impartial investigation. And as the means provided by nature for continuing the race of other animals may probably throw light upon the œconomy of nature with respect to man, I begin with that article, which has not engaged the attention of naturalists so much as it ought to do. With respect to animals whose nourishment is grass, pairing would be of no use; the female feeds herself and her young at the same instant, and the male has nothing to do. On the other hand, all brute animals whose young require the nursing care of both parents, are directed by nature to pair; nor is that connection dissolved till the young can provide for themselves. Pairing is indispensable to wild birds that build on trees; because the male must provide food for his mate while she is hatching the eggs. And as they have commonly a numerous issue, it requires the labour of both to pick up food for themselves and for their young. Upon that account it is so ordered, that the young are sufficiently vigorous to provide for themselves, before a new brood is produced.

What I have now opened suggests the following question, Whether, according to the animal œconomy above display'd, are we to presume, or not, that man is directed by nature to matrimony? If analogy can be rely'd on, the affirmative must be held, as there is

no

no other creature in the known world to which pairing is so necessary. Man is a long-lived animal, and is proportionally slow in growing to maturity: he is a helpless being before the age of fifteen or sixteen, and there may be in a family ten or twelve children of different births before the eldest can shift for itself. Now in the original state of hunting and fishing, which are laborious occupations, and not always successful, a woman suckling her infant is not able to provide food even for herself, far less for ten or twelve voracious children. Matrimony therefore, or pairing, is so necessary to the human race, that it must be natural and instinctive. When such ample means are provided for continuing every other animal race, is it supposable that the chief race would be neglected? Providential care descends even to vegetable life: every plant bears a profusion of seed; and in order to cover the earth with vegetables, some seeds have wings, some are scattered by means of a spring, and some are so light as to be carried about by the wind. Brute animals which do not pair, have grass and other food in plenty, enabling the female to feed her young without needing any help from the male. But where the young require the nursing care of both parents, pairing is a law of nature. When other races are so amply provided for, can it be seriously thought, that Providence is less attentive to the human race? If men and women were not impelled by nature to matrimony, they would be less fitted for continuing their species than even the humblest plant. Have we not reason fairly to conclude, that matrimony in the human race is an appointment of nature? Can that conclusion be resisted by any one who believes in Providence, and in final causes*.

* It appears a wise appointment of Providence, that women give over child-bearing at fifty, while they are still in vigour of mind and body to take care of their offspring. Did the power of procreation continue in women to old age as in men, children

To confirm this doctrine, let the consequences of a loose commerce between the sexes be examined. The carnal appetite, when confined to one object, seldom transgresses the bounds of temperance. But were it encouraged to roam like a bee sucking honey from every flower, every new object would inflame the imagination; and satiety with respect to one, would give new vigour with respect to others: a generic habit would be formed of intemperance in fruition (*a*); and animal love would become the ruling passion. Men, like the hart in rutting-time, would all the year round fly with impetuosity from object to object, giving no quarter even to women suckling their infants: and women, abandoning themselves to the same passion, would become altogether regardless of their offspring. In that state, the continuance of the human race would be a miracle. In the savage state, as mentioned above, it is beyond the power of any woman to provide food for a family of children; and now it appears, that intemperance in animal love would render a woman careless of her family, however easy it might be to provide for it *.

children would often be left in the wide world, without a mortal to look after them.

* I have often been tempted to find fault with Providence in bringing so early to perfection the carnal appetite, while a man, still in early youth, has acquired no degree of prudence nor of self-command. It rages indeed the most when young men should be employ'd in acquiring knowledge, and in fitting themselves for living comfortably in the world. I have set this thought in various lights; but I now perceive that the censure is without foundation. The early ripeness of this appetite proves it to be the intention of Providence that people should early settle in matrimony. In that state the appetite is abundantly moderate, and gives no obstruction to education. It never becomes unruly, till one, forgetting the matrimonial tie, wanders from object to object. It is pride and luxury that dictate late marriages: industry never fails to afford the means of living comfortably, provided men confine themselves to the demands of nature.

(*a*) Elements of Criticism, chap. 14.

I say more: The promiscuous use of women would unqualify them in a great measure from procreating, or having a family. The carnal appetite in man resembles his appetite for food: both of them demand gratification without end, after short intervals. Where the carnal appetite is felt but a short space annually, as among animals who feed on grass, the promiscuous use of females is according to the order of nature: but such a law in man, where the carnal appetite is always awake, would be an effectual bar to population; as it is an undoubted truth, that women who indulge that appetite to excess, seldom have children; and if all women were common, all women would in effect be common prostitutes.

If undisguised nature show itself any where, it is in children. So truly is matrimony an instinct of nature, as to be understood even by children. They often hear, it is true, people talking of matrimony; but they also hear of logical, metaphysical, and commercial matters, without understanding a syllable. Whence then their notion of marriage but from nature? Marriage at the same time is a compound idea, which no instruction could bring within the comprehension of a child, did not nature co-operate.

That the arguments urged above against a promiscuous use of women do not necessarily conclude against polygamy, or the union of one man with a plurality of women, will not escape an attentive reader. St Augustin and other fathers admit, that polygamy is not prohibited by the law of nature; and the learned Grotius professes the same opinion (a). But great names terrify me not; and I venture to maintain, that pairing in the strictest sense is a law of nature among men as among wild birds; and that polygamy is a gross infringement of this law. My reasons follow.

(a) De jure belli ac pacis, lib. 2. cap. 5. § 9.

I urge, in the first place, the equal number of males and females, as a clear indication of the will of God, that every man should be confined to one wife, and every woman to one husband. That equality which has subsisted in all countries, and at all times, is a signal instance of over-ruling Providence; for the chances against it are infinite. All men are by nature equal in rank; and every man consequently is equally privileged to have a wife; which cannot be, if polygamy be permitted. Were ten women born for one man, as is falsely reported to be the case in Bantam, polygamy might be the intention of Providence; but from the equality of males and females, it is clearly the voice of nature, as well as of the sacred scripture, "That a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and that they shall be one flesh."

Consider, in the next place, that however plausible polygamy may appear in the present state of things, where inequality of rank and of fortune have produced luxury and sensuality; yet that the laws of nature were not contrived by our Maker for a forc'd state, where numberless individuals are degraded below their natural rank, for the benefit of a few who are elevated above it. To form a just notion of polygamy, we must look back to the original state of man, where all are equal. In that state, every man cannot have two wives; and consequently no man is intitled to more than one, till every other be upon an equal footing with him. At the same time, the union of one man with one woman is much better calculated for continuing the race, than the union of one man with many women. Think of a savage who may have fifty or sixty children by different wives, all depending for food upon his industry. Chance must turn out much in his favour, if the half of them perish not by hunger. How much a better chance for life have infants who are distributed more equally in different families?

Polygamy

Polygamy is attended with an effect still more pernicious, with respect to children even of the most opulent families. Unless affection be reciprocal and equal, there can be no proper society in the matrimonial state, no cordiality, nor due care of offspring. But such affection is inconsistent with polygamy: a woman in that state, far from being a companion to her husband, is degraded to the rank of a servant, a mere instrument of pleasure and propagation. Among many wives there will always be a favourite: the rest turn peevish; and if they resent not the injury against their husband, and against their children as belonging to him, will, at least, be disheartened, and neglect them altogether. At the same time, fondness for the favourite wife and her children makes the husband indifferent about the rest; and woful is the condition of children who are neglected by both parents (a). To produce such an effect, is certainly not the purpose of nature.

It merits peculiar attention, that Providence has provided for an agreeable union among all creatures who are taught by nature to pair. Animal love among creatures who pair not, is confined within a narrow space of time: while the dam is occupied about her young, animal love lies dormant, that she may not be abstracted from her duty. In pairing animals, on the contrary, animal love is always awake: frequent enjoyment endears a pair to each other, and makes constancy a pleasure. Such is the case of the human race; and such is the case of wild birds (b). Among the wild birds that build on trees, the male, after feeding his mate in the nest, plants himself upon the next spray, and cheers her with a song. There is still greater pleasure provided for the human race in the matrimonial state, and stronger incitements to

(a) *Esprit des loix*, liv. 18. chap. 8.
 (b) Buffon, liv. 5. p. 359. octavo edition.

constancy. Sweet is the society of a pair fitted for each other, in whom are collected the affections of husband, wife, lover, friend, the tenderest affections of human nature. Public government is in perfection, when the sovereign commands with humanity, and the subjects are cordial in their obedience. Private government in conjugal society arrives at still greater perfection, where husband and wife govern and are governed reciprocally, with entire satisfaction to both. The man bears rule over his wife's person and conduct; she bears rule over his inclinations; he governs by law; and she by persuasion. Nor can her authority ever fail, where it is supported by sweetness of temper, and zeal to make him happy*.

The

* L'empire de la femme est un empire de douceur, d'adresse, et de complaisance; ses ordres sont des caresses, ses menaces sont des pleurs. Elle doit regner dans la maison comme un ministre dans l'état, en se faisant commander ce qu'elle veut faire. En ce sens il est constant que les meilleurs ménages sont ceux où la femme a le plus d'autorité. Mais quand elle meconnoit la voix du chef, qu'elle veut usurper ses droits et commander elle-même; il ne résulte jamais de ce désordre, que misère, scandale, et deshonneur. *Rousseau Emile*, liv. 5. p. 96. — [In *English* thus: "The empire of the woman is an empire of softness, of address, of complacency; her commands are caresses, her menaces are tears. She ought to reign in the family like a minister in the state, by making that which is her inclination be enjoined to her as her duty. Thus it is evident, that the best domestic economy is that where the wife has most authority. But when she is insensible to the voice of her chief, when she tries to usurp his prerogative, and to command alone, what can result from such disorder, but misery, scandal, and dishonour?"] — The Empress Livia being questioned by a married lady, how she had obtained such ascendant over her husband Augustus, answered, "By being obedient to his commands, by not wishing to know his secrets, and by hiding my knowledge of his amours." The late Queen of Spain was a woman of singular prudence, and of solid judgement. A character of her, published after her death, contains the following passage, "She had a great ascendancy over the King, founded on his persuasion of her superior sense, which she shew'd in a perfect

The God of nature has enforc'd conjugal society, not only by making it agreeable, but by the principle of chastity inherent in our nature. To animals that have no instinct for pairing, chastity is utterly unknown; and to them it would be useless. The mare, the cow, the ewe, the she-goat, receive the male without ceremony, and admit the first that comes in the way without distinction. Neither have tame fowl any notion of chastity: they pair not; and the female gets no food from the male, even during incubation. But chastity and mutual fidelity are essential to all pairing animals; for wandering inclinations would render them negligent in nursing their young. Wild birds pair; and they are by instinct faithful to each other while their young require nurture. Chastity and mutual fidelity in matrimony are equally essential to the human race, and equally enforc'd by the principle of chastity, a branch of the moral sense.

Nor is chastity confined to the matrimonial state. Matrimony is instituted by nature for continuing the species; and it is the duty of man to abstain from animal enjoyment except in that state. The ceremonies of marriage, and the causes of separation and divorce, are subjected to municipal law: but if a man beget children, it is his duty to unite with the mother in taking care of them; and such union is matrimony according to the law of nature. Hence it is, that the first acts of incontinence, where enjoyment only is in view, are always attended with shame, and with a degree of remorse. At the same time, as chastity in persons who are single is only a self-duty, it is not so strongly enforc'd by the moral sense as chastity is in married persons, who

"perfect submission to his commands; the more easily obey'd, as they were commonly, tho' to him imperceptibly, dictated by herself. She cured him of many foibles, and in a word was his Minerva, under the appearance of Mentor."

owe to each other mutual fidelity. Deviations accordingly from the former make a less figure than from the latter: we scarce ever hear of adultery among savages; tho' among them incontinence before marriage is not uncommon. In Wales, even at present, and in the highlands of Scotland, it is scarce a disgrace for a young woman to have a bastard. In the country last mentioned, the first instance known of a bastard-child being destroy'd by its mother through shame is a late one. The virtue of chastity appears to be there gaining ground; as the only temptation a woman can have to destroy her child is, to conceal her frailty. The principle of chastity, like that of propriety or of decency, is but faint among savages, and has little of that authority which it acquires among polished nations before they are corrupted by luxury. We shall have occasion to see afterward, that even the great duty of justice is but faint among barbarians, and yields too readily to every irregular impulse, till the moral sense acquires full maturity. Bougainville reports, that in the island of Otaheite, or King George's island, a young woman is free to follow her inclinations; and that her having had many lovers gives her not the less chance for a husband.

Chastity is no doubt a restraint upon nature; and therefore, if shame be removed, by making it lawful to obey the appetite, nature will prevail. In the year 1707, a contagious distemper having carried off a large proportion of the inhabitants of Iceland, the King of Denmark fell on a device to repopulate the country, which succeeded to a wish. A law was made, authorising young women in that island to have bastards, even to the number of six, without wounding their reputation *. The young women were so
zealous

* Don Juan de Ulloa, in his voyage to Peru, mentions a very singular taste prevalent in that country, that a man never takes a virgin to wife; and thinks himself dishonoured

zealous to repeople their country, that after a few years it was found proper to abrogate the law.

Modesty is by nature intended to guard chastity, as chastity is to guard matrimony. And modesty, like chastity, is one of those delicate principles that make no great figure among savages. In the land of Jesso, young women sometimes go naked in summer: if however they meet a stranger, they hang the head, and turn away through shame. Nature here is their only instructor*. Some savage tribes have so little notion of modesty, as to go naked, without even covering their privy parts. Regnard reports upon his own knowledge, that in Lapland, man, woman, and child, take the hot bath promiscuously, and are not ashamed to be seen in that condition, even by a stranger. As this appeared singular, I took opportunity to mention it to Dr Solander, who made more than one visit to that country. He said, that Regnard's report might be true, but without any imputation on the modesty of the Laplanders; for that their place of bathing is always so dark, that nothing can be seen. He added, that the females in Lapland, both married and unmarried, are extremely chaste. The inhabitants of Otaheite, tho' otherwise a good sort of people, seem to have as little notion of modesty as of chastity. We have Bougainville's authority, that they frankly offered their young women to the French, and were greatly surpris'd when they declined performing in public. The women of New Zeland are both chaste and modest. In Lieutenant Cook's voyage round the world, it is reported, that he stumbled upon some of them naked, searching for dishonoured if his wife have not, before marriage, enjoy'd many lovers. If we can trust Paulus Venetus, a young woman of Thibet, in Asia, is not reckoned fit to be married till she be deflowered.

* Doth not modesty prevail among many animals? Elephants are never seen in copulation, nor cats, nor beasts of prey.

lobsters

lobsters in the sea; and that they were in great confusion for being seen in this condition by strangers.

But now, if pairing in the strictest sense be a law of nature among men, as among some other animals, how is polygamy to be accounted for, which formerly was universal, and to this day obtains among many nations? I am reduced to no dilemma here. Polygamy is derived from two sources; first, from savage manners, once universal; and next, from voluptuousness in warm climates, which instigates men of wealth to transgress every rule of temperance. These two sources I propose to handle with care, because they make a great part of the history of the female sex.

With respect to the first, sweetness of temper, a capital branch of the female character, displays itself externally, by mild looks, and gentle manners. But such graces are scarce perceptible in a female savage; and even in the most polished would not be perceived by a male savage. Among savages, strength and boldness are the only valued qualities: in these qualities females are miserably deficient; and for that reason are contemned by the males, as beings of an inferior order. The North-American tribes glory in idleness: the drudgery of labour degrades a man in their opinion, and is proper for women only. To join young persons in marriage is accordingly the business of parents; and it would be unpardonable meanness in the bridegroom to shew any fondness for the bride. Young men among the Hottentots are admitted into society with their seniors at the age of eighteen; after which it is disgraceful to keep company with females. In Guiana, a woman never eats with her husband; but after every meal attends him with water for washing. A woman in the Caribbee islands is not permitted to eat even in presence of her husband; and yet we are assured (a), that the women there obey with such sweet-

(a) Labat's voyages to the American islands,

ness and respect, as never to give their husbands occasion to remind them of their duty; "an example," adds our sage author, "worthy the imitation of Christian wives, who are daily instructed from the pulpit in the duties of obedience and conjugal fidelity, *but to very little purpose.*" Dampier observes in general, that among all the wild nations he was acquainted with, the women carry the burdens, while the men walk before, and carry nothing but their arms. Women even of the highest rank are not better treated. The sovereign of Giaga, in Africa, has many wives, who are literally his slaves: one carries his bow, one his arrows, and one gives him drink; and while he is drinking, they all fall on their knees, clap their hands, and sing. Not many centuries ago, a law was made in England, prohibiting the New Testament in English to be read by women, 'prentices, journeymen, or serving men (a). What a pitiful figure must the poor women have made in that age! In Siberia, and even in Russia, the capital excepted, men treat their wives in every respect as slaves. The regulations of Peter I. put marriage upon a more respectable footing among people of rank; and yet such are the brutal manners of the Russians, that tyrannical treatment of wives is far from being eradicated.

The low condition of the female sex among savages and barbarians paved the way to polygamy. Savages, excited by a taste for variety, and still more by pride, which is gratified by many servants, delight in a multiplicity of wives. The pairing principle, tho' rooted in human nature, makes little figure among savages, yielding to every irregular appetite; and this fairly accounts why polygamy was once universal. It might indeed be thought, that animal love, were there nothing else, should have raised women

(a) 34th and 35th Henry VIII. cap. 1.

to some degree of estimation among the men. But male savages, utter strangers to decency or refinement, gratify animal love with as little ceremony as they do hunger or thirst. Hence appears the reason of a custom that will surprise those who are unacquainted with ancient customs; which is, that women were purchased for wives, as other goods are purchased. Women by marriage became slaves; and no man will give away his daughter to be a slave, but for a valuable consideration. The practice was universal. I begin with the Jews. Abraham bought Rebekah, and gave her to his son Isaac for a wife (a). Jacob having nothing else to give, served Laban fourteen years for two wives (b). Sechem demanding in marriage Dinah, Jacob's daughter, said, "Ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me; but give me the damsel to wife (c)." To David, demanding Saul's daughter in marriage, Saul said, "The king desireth not any dowry, but an hundred foreskins of the Philistines (d)." In the Iliad, Agamemnon offers his daughter to Achilles for a wife, and says, that he would not demand for her any price. Pausanias reports of Danaus, that no suitors appearing to demand any of his daughters, he published, that he would give them without dowry. In Homer there is frequent mention of nuptial gifts from a bridegroom to his bride's father. From terming them gifts, it is probable that the former method of purchase was beginning to wear out. It wore out before the time of Aristotle, who infers, that their forefathers must have been a very rude people. The ancient Spaniards

(a) Genesis, xxiv. 53.

(b) Genesis, chap. xxix.

(c) Genesis, xxxiv. 12.

(d) 1 Samuel xviii. 25.

purchased their wives. We have the authority of Herodotus and of Heraclides Ponticus, that the same was practised in Thrace. And the latter adds, that if a wife was ill treated, her relations could demand her back, upon repaying the price they got for her. In the Roman law mention is made of matrimony *per æs et libram*, which was solemnized by laying down a quantity of brass, with a balance for weighing it, understood to be the price paid for the bride. This must have been once a reality, tho' it sunk down to be a mere ceremony, after it became customary for a Roman bride to bring a dowry with her. The Babylonians and the Assyrians, at stated times, collected all the marriageable young women, and disposed of them by auction. Rubruguis, in his voyage to Tartary ann. 1253, reports, that there every man bought his wife. They believe, he adds, that their wives serve them in another world as they do in this; for which reason, a widow has no chance for a second husband, whom she cannot serve in the other world. Olaus Magnus remarking, that among the ancient Goths no dower was provided on the bride's part, gives a reason, better suited perhaps to the time he lived in than to what he describes. "Apud Gothos, non mulier viro sed vir mulieri dotem assignat; ne conjux, ob magnitudinem dotis insolescens, aliquando ex placida conforte proterva evadet, atque in maritum dominari contendat*," as if the hazard of petulancy in a wife would hinder a man to accept a dower with her; — a sad doctrine for an heiress. Giraldus Cambrensis, in his description of Wales, says, that formerly they hardly ever married without a prior cohabitation, it having been customary for parents to let out their daughters to young men upon trial, for a sum of money told down, and under a penalty if the girls were returned. This I believe to be a mistake. It is more

* " Among the Goths, a man gave a dowry for his bride, instead of receiving one with her; to prevent pride and insolence, that commonly accompany riches on the woman's part."

probable, that in Wales men purchased their wives, as was done all the world over, with liberty to return them if they proved not agreeable. The bride's parents retained the dowry, and her chance for a husband was as good as ever.

The same custom continues among barbarous nations. It continues among the Tartars, among the Mingrelians, among the Samoides, among the Ostiaks, among the people of Pegu, and of the Molucca islands. In Timor, an East-Indian island, men even sell their children to purchase more wives. The Prince of Circassia demanded from the Prince of Mingrelia, who was in suit of his daughter, a hundred slaves loaded with tapestry and other household furniture, a hundred cows, as many oxen, and as many horses. We have evidence of the same custom in Africa, particularly in Biledulgerid, among the negroes on the sea-coast, and in Monomotapa. Among the Caribbees there is one instance where a man gets a wife without paying for her. After a successful war, the victors are entertained at a feast, where the General harangues on the valour of the young men who made the best figure. Every man who has marriageable daughters, is fond to offer them to such young men without any price. The purchasing of wives is universal among the wild Arabs. When the bargain is concluded, the bridegroom is permitted to visit the bride: if she answer not his expectations, he may turn her off; but has no claim for the price he paid. The inland negroes are more polished than those on the coast; and there is scarce any remains among them of purchasing wives: the bridegroom makes presents to his bride, and her father makes presents to him. There are remaining traces in Russia of purchasing wives. Even so late as the time of Peter I. the Russians married without seeing each other; and before solemnization the bride received from the bridegroom a present of sweetmeats, soap, and other little things.

The purchasing of wives made it a lawful practice to lend a wife as one does a slave. The Spartans lent their wives to their friends; and

and Cato the elder is said to have done the same. The Indians of Calicut frequently exchange wives.

If brutish manners alone be sufficient to degrade the female sex, they may reckon upon extreme harsh treatment when purchased to be slaves. The Giagas, a fierce and wandering nation in the central parts of Africa, being supinely idle at home, subject their wives and their slaves to every sort of drudgery, such as digging, sowing, reaping, cutting wood, grinding corn, fetching water, &c. These poor creatures are suffered to toil in the fields and woods, ready to faint with excessive labour, while the monsters of men will not give themselves even the trouble of training animals for work, tho' they have the example of the Portuguese before their eyes. It is the business of the women among the wandering Arabs of Africa to card, spin, and weave, and to manage other household affairs. They milk the cattle, grind, bake, brew, dress the victuals, and bring home wood and water. They even take care of their husbands horses, feed, curry, comb, bridle, and saddle them. They would also be obliged, like Moorish wives, to dig, sow, and reap their corn; but luckily for them the Arabs live entirely upon plunder. Father Joseph Gumilla, in his account of a country in South America, bordering upon the great river Oronoko, describes pathetically the miserable slavery of married women there, and mentions a practice that would appear incredible to one unacquainted with the manners of that country, which is, that married women frequently destroy their female infants. A married woman, of a virtuous character and good understanding, having been guilty of that crime, was reproached by our author in bitter terms. She heard him patiently to an end, with eyes fixed on the ground; and answered as follows.

"with to God, Father, I with to God, that my mother had
"by my death prevented the manifold distresses I have endured, and have yet to endure as long I live. Had she kindly
A a 2

"sifted me at my birth, I should not have felt the pain of death, nor numberless other pains to which life hath subjected me. Consider, Father, our deplorable condition. Our husbands go to hunt with their bows and arrows, and trouble themselves no farther. We are dragged along, with one infant at our breast, and another in a basket. They return in the evening without any burden: we return with the burden of our children; and, tho' tired out with a long march, are not permitted to sleep, but must labour the whole night in grinding maize, to make chicha for them. They get drunk, and in their drunkenness beat us, draw us by the hair of the head, and tread us under foot. And what have we to comfort us for slavery, perhaps of twenty years? A young wife is brought in upon us, who is permitted to abuse us and our children, because we are no longer regarded. Can human nature endure such tyranny! What kindness can we show to our female children equal to that of relieving them from such servitude, more bitter a thousand times than death? I say again, would to God that my mother had put me under ground the moment I was born." One would readily imagine, that the women of that country should have the greatest abhorrence at matrimony: but all-prevailing nature determines the contrary; and the appetite for matrimony overbalances every rational consideration.

Nations polish by degrees; and from the lowest state to which a human creature can be reduced, women came in time to be restored to their native dignity. Attention to dress is the first symptom of that progress. Male savages, even of the grossest kind, are fond of dress. Charlevoix mentions a young American hired as a rower, who adjusted his dress with great care before he entered the boat; and at intervals inspected his looking-glass, to see whether the violence of his motion had not discomposed the red upon his cheeks. We read not of vanity for dress in females of such

such savage nations: they are too much dispirited to think of being agreeable. Among nations in any degree humanized we find a different scene. In the isthmus of Darien government has made some progress, as a chieftain is elected for life: a glimmering of civility appears among the inhabitants; and as some regard is paid to women, they rival the men in dress. Both sexes wear rings in their ears and noses; and are adorned with many rows of shells hanging down from the neck. A female in a sultry climate submits to fry all day long under a load of twenty or thirty pounds of shells; and a male under double that load. Well may they exclaim with Alexander, "Oh Athenians! what do I not endure to gain your approbation?" The female Caribbeans and Brilians are not less fond of ornament than the male. Hottentot ladies are fond of dress; and strive to outdo each other in adorning their krosses, and the bag that holds their pipe and tobacco: European ladies are not more vain of their silks and embroideries. Women in Lapland are much addicted to finery. They wear broad girdles, upon which hang chains and rings without end, commonly made of tin, sometimes of silver, weighing perhaps twenty pounds. The Greenlanders are nasty and slovenly, eat with their dogs, make food of the vermin that make food of them, seldom or never wash themselves; and yet the women, who make some figure among the men, are gaudy in their dress. Their chief ornaments are pendants at their ears, with glass beads of various colours; and they draw lines with a needle and black thread between their eyes, cross the forehead, upon the chin, hands, and legs. The negroes of the kingdom of Ardrah in Guinea have made a considerable progress in police, and in the art of living. Their women carry dress and finery to an extravagance. They are clothed with loads of the finest satins and chintzes, and are adorned with a profusion of gold. In a sultry climate they gratify vanity at the expence of ease. Among the inland negroes, who are
more

more polished than those on the sea-coast, beside domestic concerns, the women sow, plant, and reap. A man however suffers in the esteem of the world, if he permit his wives to toil like slaves while he is indulging in ease. From that auspicious commencement, the female sex have risen in a slow but steady progress to higher and higher degrees of estimation. Conversation is their talent, and a display of delicate sentiments; the gentleness of their manners, and winning behaviour, captivate every sensible heart. Of such refinements savages have little conception: but when the more delicate senses are unfolded, the peculiar beauties of the female sex, internal as well as external, are brought into full light; and women, formerly considered as objects of animal love merely, are now valued as faithful friends and agreeable companions. Matrimony assumes a more decent form, being the union, not of a master and slave, but of two persons equal in rank uniting to form a family. And it contributed greatly to this delicious refinement, that in temperate climes animal love is moderate, and women long retain good looks, and power of procreation. Thus marriage became honourable among polished nations; which of course banished the barbarous custom of purchasing wives; for a man who wishes to have his daughter properly married, will gladly give a dowry with her, instead of selling her as a slave.

Polygamy is found intimately connected with the purchasing wives. There is no limitation in purchasing slaves: nor has a woman purchased as a wife or a slave, any just cause for complaining, that others are purchased as she was: on the contrary, she is in part relieved, by addition of hands for performing the servile offices of the family. Polygamy accordingly has always been permitted, where men pay for their wives. The Jews purchased their wives, and were indulged in polygamy (a). Diodorus Sicu-

(a) Leviticus, xviii. 18.

lus says, that polygamy was permitted in Egypt, except to priests (a). This probably was the case originally; but when the Egyptian manners came to be polished, a man gave a dowry with his daughter, instead of receiving a price for her; witness Solomon, who got the city of Gazer in dowry with the King of Egypt's daughter. When that custom became universal, we may be certain that it would put an end to polygamy. And accordingly Herodotus affirms, that polygamy was prohibited in Egypt (b). Polygamy undoubtedly prevailed in Greece and Rome, while it was customary to purchase wives; but improved manners put an end to the latter, and consequently to the former. Polygamy to this day obtains in the cold country of Kamiskatka; and in the still colder country round Hudson's bay. In the land of Jesso, near Japan, a man may have two wives, who perform every sort of domestic drudgery. The negroes in general purchase their wives, and deal in polygamy. Polygamy is the law in Monomotapa. Polygamy and the purchasing wives were customary among the original inhabitants of the Canary islands. The men in Chili buy their wives, and deal in polygamy.

The low condition of women among barbarians introduced polygamy, and the purchasing women to be wives. And the just respect paid to them among civilized nations, restored the law of nature, and confined a man to one wife. Their equality as to rank and dignity bars the man from taking another wife, as it bars the woman from taking another husband. We find traces in ancient History of polygamy wearing out gradually. It wore out in Greece, as manners refined; but such was the influence of long habit, that tho' a man was confined to one wife, concubines were in-
 (a) Lib. 2. § 92.

(b) Lib. 2. § 92.

dulged without limitation. In Germany, when Tacitus wrote, very few traces remained of polygamy. "Severa illic matrimonia, nec ullam morum partem magis laudaveris: nam prope soli barbarorum singulis uxoribus contenti sunt, exceptis admodum paucis, qui non libidine, sed ob nobilitatem, plurimis nuptiis ambiuntur*." When polygamy was in that country so little practised, we may be certain the purchasing wives did not remain in vigour. And Tacitus accordingly, mentioning the general rule, "dotem non uxor marito, sed uxori maritus offert †," explains it away by observing, that the only *dos* given by the bridegroom were marriage-presents, and that he at the same time received marriage-presents on the bride's part (a). The equality of the matrimonial engagement, for the mutual benefit of husband and wife, was well understood among the Gauls. Cæsar (b) says, "Viri quantas pecunias ab uxoribus dotis nomine acceperunt, tantas ex suis bonis, æstimatione facta, cum dotibus communicant. Hujus omnis pecuniæ conjunctim ratio habetur, fructusque servantur. Uter eorum vita superarit, ad eum pars utriusque cum fructibus superiorum temporum pervenit ‡." In

* "Marriage is there rigidly respected; nor is there any part of their morality more laudable: for they are almost the only race of barbarians who are contented with a single wife; a very few excepted, who, not from incontinency, but from an ambition of nobility, take more wives than one."

† "The husband gives a dowry to the wife, but the wife brings none to the husband."

‡ "Whatever sum the husband has received as his wife's portion, he allows as much from his own effects to be joined with it. An account is kept of this joint stock, and the fruits of it are preserved. Upon the death of either, the surviving spouse has the property of both the shares, with the fruits or profits."

(a) *De moribus Germanorum*, cap. 18.

(b) *Lib. 6. cap. 19. De bello Gallico.*

Japan,

Japan, and in Nicaragua, a man can have but one wife; but he may have many concubines. In Siam, polygamy is still permitted, though the bride brings a dowry with her; but that absurdity is corrected by refined manners; it being held improper, and even disgraceful, to have more than one wife. The purchasing wives wore out of fashion among the ancient Tuscans; for it was held infamous, that marriage should be the result of any motive but mutual love. This at the same time put an end to polygamy. Polygamy was probably early eradicated among the ancient Persians; for the bride's dowry was settled in marriage-articles, as among us. And there is the same reason for presuming, that it was not long permitted in Mexico; marriage there being solemnized by the priest, and the bride's dower specified, which was restored in case of a separation. In the countries where the Christian religion was first propagated, women were fast advancing to an equality with the men, and polygamy was wearing out of fashion. The pure spirit of the gospel hastened its downfall; and tho' not prohibited expressly, it was however held, that Christianity is a religion too pure for polygamy.

But, as hinted above, it was by slow degrees that the female sex emerged out of slavery, to possess the elevated state they justly are intitled to by nature. The practice of exposing infants among the Greeks, and many other nations, is an invincible proof of their depression, even after the custom ceased of purchasing them. It is wisely ordered by Providence, that the affection of a woman to her children commences with their birth, because during infancy all depends on her care. As during that period the father is of little use to his child, his affection is extremely slight till the child begins to prattle and shew some fondness for him. The exposing an infant therefore shews, that the mother was little regarded: if she had been allowed a vote, the practice never would have obtained in any country. In the first book of the Iliad, Achilles says to A-

ganeion, who threatened to force from him his mistress Briseis,
 " Another thing I will tell thee : record it in thy soul. For a wo-
 " man these hands shall never fight, with thee nor with thy foes.
 " Come, seize Briseis : ye Argives, take the prize ye gave. But
 " beware of other spoil, which lies stowed in my ships on the
 " shore. I will not be plundered farther. If other be thy thoughts,
 " Atreides, come in arms, a trial make : these very slaves of thine
 " shall behold thy blood pouring around my spear *." The co-
 medies of Menander, Philemon, and Diphilus, are lost ; but man-
 ners must have been little polished in their time, so far as can be
 conjectured from their translators or imitators, Plautus and Te-
 rence. Married women in their comedies are sometimes intro-
 duced, and treated with very little respect. A man commonly
 vents his wrath on his wife, and scolds her as the cause of the
 misconduct of their children. A lady, perhaps too inquisitive about
 her husband's amours, is scolded by him in the following words.

* Pope hides that sentiment as follows.

" Seize on Briseis, whom the Grecians doom'd
 " My prize of war, yet tamely see resum'd ;
 " And seize secure ; no more Achilles draws
 " His conqu'ring sword in any woman's cause.
 " The gods command me to forgive the past ;
 " But let this first invasion be the last :
 " For know, thy blood, when next thou dar'st invade,
 " Shall stream in vengeance on my reeking blade."

Such contempt of the female sex as expressed by Achilles was perhaps thought too gross for a modern ear without some disguise. But did not Pope discover, that one capital beauty in Homer is the delineation of ancient manners ? At that rate, had it fallen to his share to describe Julius Cæsar, he would have dressed him like a modern beau. And after all, in a genteel assembly, what a savage would he appear, without breeches, and without linen !

"Ni mala, ni stulta sis, ni indomita impôsque animi,"

"Quod viro esse odio videas, tute tibi odio habeas."

"Præter hac si mihi tale post hunc diem

"Faxis, faxo foris vidua vifas patrem *."

One will not be surpris'd, that women in Greece were treated with no great respect by their husbands. A woman cannot have much attraction who passes all her time in solitude: to be admir'd, she must receive the high polish of society. At the same time, men of fashion were so much improved in manners as to relish society with agreeable women, where such could be found. And hence the figure that courtezans made at that period, especially in Athens. They studied the temper and taste of the men, and endeavour'd to gain their affection by every winning art. The daily conversations they listened to on philosophy, politics, poetry, enlightened their understanding and improved their taste. Their houses became agreeable schools, where every one might be instructed in his own art. Socrates and Pericles met frequently at the house of Aspasia: from her they acquired delicacy of taste, and in return procur'd to her public respect and reputation. Greece at that time was governed by orators, over whom some celebrated courtezans had great influence, and by that means enter'd deep into the government. It was said of the famous Demosthenes, "The measure he hath meditated on for a year, will

* "Would you be held a wife and virtuous spouse,

"And of discretion due, observe this counsel:

"Whatever I, your lord, blame or approve,

"Still let your praise or censure be the same.

"But hearkee, — be this reprimand the last:

"If you again offend, no more a wife

"Within these walls; — your father has you back."

"be overturned in a day by a woman." It appears accordingly from Plautus and Terence, that Athenian courtezans lived in great splendor. See in particular *Theautontimorumenos*, act 3. scene 2.

I proceed to the other cause of polygamy, mentioned also above, viz. opulence in a hot climate. Men there have a burning appetite for animal enjoyment; and women become old and lose the prolific quality, not long after the age of maturity in a temperate climate. These circumstances dispose men of opulence to purchase their wives, that they may not be confined to one; and purchase they must, for no man, without a valuable consideration, will surrender his daughter to be one of many who are destined to gratify the carnal appetite of one man. The numerous wives and concubines in Asiatic harems are all of them purchased with money. In the hot climate of Hindostan, polygamy is universal, and men buy their wives. The same obtains in China: after the price is adjusted and paid, the bride is conducted to the bridegroom's house locked in a sedan, and the key delivered to him: if he be not satisfied with his bargain, he sends her back at the expence of losing the sum he paid for her: if satisfied, he feasts his male friends in one room, and she her female friends in another. A man who has little substance takes a wife for his son from a hospital, which saves him a dowry.

It has been pleaded for polygamy in warm climates, that women are fit for being married at or before the age of ten, and past child-bearing at twenty-five, while men are yet in the prime of life; and therefore that a second wife ought to be permitted, who can bear children. Is then the interest of the female sex to be totally disregarded in the matrimonial engagement, as if women were intended by nature for beasts of burden only? But even putting them out of the question, it ought to be considered, that a man, by taking a second wife, deprives some other of the privilege all men have to be married. The argument indeed would

be

be conclusive, were ten females born for one male, as is said to be the case in Bantam: but as an equality of males and females is the destination of nature, the argument has no force. All men are born equal by nature; and to permit polygamy in any degree, is to authorise some to usurp the privilege of others. Thus in hot climates women remain in the same humble and dependent state, in which all women were originally, when all men were savages. Women by the law of Hindostan are not admitted to be witnesses, even in a civil cause; and I blush to acknowledge, that in Scotland the same law has not been long in disuse.

In contradiction to the climate, Christianity has banished polygamy from Ethiopia, tho' the judges are far from being severe upon that crime. The heat of the climate makes them wish to indulge in a plurality of wives, even at the expence of purchasing each of them. Among the Christians of Congo polygamy is in use, as formerly when they were Pagans. To be confined to one wife during life, is held by the most zealous Christians there, to be altogether irrational: rather than be so confined, they would renounce Christianity.

Beside polygamy, many other customs depend on the nature of the matrimonial engagement, and vary according to its different kinds. Marriage-ceremonies, for that reason, vary in different countries, and at different times. Where the practice is to purchase a wife, whether among savages, or among pampered people in hot climates, the payment of the price completes the marriage, without any other ceremony. Other ceremonies however are sometimes practised. In old Rome, the bride was attended to the bridegroom's house with a female slave carrying a distaff and a spindle, importing that she ought to spin for the family. Among the savages of Canada and of the neighbouring countries, a strap, a kettle, and a faggot, are put in the bride's cabin, as symbols of her

her duty, viz. to carry burdens, to dress the victuals, and to provide wood. On the other hand, the bride, in token of her slavery, takes her axe, cuts down timber, bundles it up, and lays it before the door of the bridegroom's hut. All the salutation she receives is, "It is time to go to rest." The inhabitants of Sierra Leona, a negro country, have in all their towns a boarding-school, where young ladies are educated for a year under the care of a venerable old gentleman. When their education is completed, they are carried in their best attire to a public assembly; which may be termed a matrimonial market, because there young men convene to make a choice. Those who fit themselves to their fancy, pay the dowry, and over and above gratify the old superintendent for his extraordinary care in educating the bride. In the island of Java, the bride, in token of subjection, washes the bridegroom's feet; and this is a capital ceremony. In Russia, the bride presents to the bridegroom a bundle of rods, to be used against her when she deserves to be chastised; and at the same time she pulls off his boots. The present Empress, prone to reform the rude manners of her subjects, has discountenanced that ceremony among people of fashion. Very different were the manners of Peru before the Spanish conquest. The bridegroom carried shoes to the bride, and put them on with his own hands. But there purchasing of wives was unknown. Marriage-ceremonies in Lapland are directed by the same principle. It is the custom there for a man to make presents to his children of rein-deer; and young women, such as have a large stock of rein-deer, have lovers in plenty. A young man looks for such a wife at a fair, or at their meetings for paying taxes. He carries to the house of the young woman's parents, some of his relations; being solicitous in particular to chuse an eloquent speaker. They are all admitted except the lover, who must wait till he be called in. After drinking some spirits, brought along for the purpose, the spokesman addresses the father

father in the most humble terms, bowing the knee as if he were introduced to a prince. He styles him, the worshipful father, the high and mighty father, the best and most illustrious father, &c. &c.

In viewing the chain of causes and effects, instances sometimes occur of bizarre facts, starting from the chain without any cause that can be discovered. The marriage-ceremonies among the Hottentots are of that nature. After all matters are adjusted among the old people, the young couple are shut up in a room by themselves, where they pass the night in struggling for superiority, which proves a very serious work where the bride is reluctant. If she persevere to the last without yielding, the young man is discarded; but if he prevail, which commonly happens, the marriage is completed by another ceremony, not less singular. The men and women squat on the ground in different circles, the bridegroom in the centre of one, and the bride in the centre of another. The Suri, or master of religious ceremonies, pisses on the bridegroom; who receives the stream with eagerness, and rubs it into the furrows of the fat with which he is covered. He performs the same ceremony on the bride, who is equally respectful. Marriage-ceremonies among the Kamiskatkans are still more whimsical. A young man, after making his proposals, enters into the service of his intended father-in-law. If he prove agreeable, he is admitted to the trial of the *touch*. The young woman is swaddled up in leathern thongs; and in that condition is put under the guard of some old women. He watches every opportunity of a slack guard to uncase her, in order to touch what is always the most concealed. The bride must resist, in appearance at least; and therefore cries out to summon her guards; who fall with fury upon the bridegroom, tear his hair, scratch his face, and act in violent opposition. The attempts of the lover prove sometimes unsuccessful for months; but the moment the

touch

touch is atchieved, the bride testifies her satisfaction, by pronouncing the words *Ni, Ni,* with a soft and loving voice. The next night they bed together without any opposition. One marriage-ceremony among the inland negroes is singular. So soon as preliminaries are adjusted, the bridegroom with a number of his companions set out at night, and surround the house of the bride, as if intending to carry her off by force. She and her female attendants, pretending to make all possible resistance, cry aloud for help, but no person appears. This resembles strongly a marriage-ceremony that is or was customary in Wales. On the morning of the wedding-day, the bridegroom, accompanied with his friends on horseback, demands the bride. Her friends, who are likewise on horseback, give a positive refusal, upon which a mock scuffle ensues. The bride, mounted behind her next kinsman, is carried off, and is pursued by the bridegroom and his friends with loud shouts. It is not uncommon to see on such an occasion two or three hundred sturdy Cambro-Britons riding at full speed, crossing and jostling, to the no small amusement of the spectators. When they have fatigued themselves and their horses, the bridegroom is suffered to overtake his bride. He leads her away in triumph, and the scene is concluded with feasting and festivity. The same marriage-ceremony was usual in Muscovy, Lithuania, and Livonia, as reported by Olaus Magnus (a).

Divorce also depends on the nature of the matrimonial engagement. Where the law is, that a man must purchase his wife as one does a slave; it follows naturally, that he may purchase as many as he can pay for, and that he may turn them off at his pleasure. This law is universal, without a single exception. The Jews, who purchased their wives, were privileged to divorce them,

(a) Lib. 14. cap. 9.

without being obliged to assign a cause (a). The negroes purchase their wives, and turn them off when they think proper. The same law obtains in China, in Monomotapa, in the isthmus of Darien, in Caribbeana, and even in the cold country round Hudson's bay. All the savages of South America who live near the Oroonoko, purchase as many wives as they can maintain; and divorce them at their pleasure.

Very different is a matrimonial engagement between equals, where a dowry is contracted with the bride. The nature of the engagement implies, that neither of them is privileged to dismiss the other without a just cause. In Mexico, where the bride brought a dowry, there could be no divorce but by mutual consent. In Lapland, the women who have a stock of rein-deer, as above mentioned, make a considerable figure. This lays a foundation for a matrimonial covenant as among us, which bars polygamy, and consequently divorce without a just cause. And when these are barred in several instances, the prohibition in time becomes general.

I proceed to adultery, the criminality of which depends also in some measure on the nature of the matrimonial engagement. Where wives are purchased, and polygamy is indulged, adultery can scarce be reckoned a crime in the husband; and where there are a plurality of wives, sound sense makes it but a venial crime in any one of them. But as men are the lawgivers, the punishment of female adultery, where polygamy takes place, is generally too severe. It is however more or less severe in different countries, in proportion as the men are more or less prone to revenge. The Chinese are a mild people, and depend more on locks and bars for preventing adultery, than on severity; the punish-

(a) Deuteronomy, chap. 24.

ment being only to sell an adulteress for a slave. The same law obtains in the kingdom of Laos, bordering upon China. An adulteress among the ancient Egyptians was punished with the loss of her nose. In ancient Greece, a pecuniary penalty was inflicted on an adulterer (a). An adulteress was probably punished more severely. Among the negroes, who have very little delicacy, adultery is but slightly punished; except in the kingdom of Benin. There an adulteress, after a severe whipping, is banished; and the adulterer forfeits his goods, which are bestow'd on the injured husband. Among the ancient Germans, a grave and virtuous people, adultery was extremely rare. An adulteress was deprived of her hair, expelled from her husband's house, and whipped through the village (b). In Japan, where the people are remarkably fierce, female adultery is always punished with death. In Tonquin, a woman guilty of adultery is thrown to an elephant to be destroy'd. By the law of Moses, an adulteress is punished with death, as also the adulterer (c). Margaret of Burgundy, Queen to Lewis Hutin King of France, was hang'd for adultery; and her lovers were flea'd alive. Such were the savage manners of those times. There is an old law in Wales, that for defiling the Prince's bed the offender must pay a rod of pure gold, of the thickness of the finger of a ploughman who has ploughed nine years, and in length from the ground to the Prince's mouth when sitting.

Matrimony between a single pair, for mutual comfort, and for procreating children, implies the strictest mutual fidelity. Adultery however is a deeper crime in the wife than in the husband:

(a) *Odyssey*, book 8. l. 384.

(b) Tacitus, *De moribus Germanorum*, cap. 19.

(c) *Leviticus*, xx. 10.

in him it may happen occasionally, with little or no alienation of affection; but the superior modesty of the female sex is such, that a wife does not yield, till unlawful love prevails, not only over modesty, but over duty to her husband. Adultery therefore in the wife, is a breach of the matrimonial engagement in a double respect: it is an alienation of affection from the husband, which unqualifies her to be his friend and companion; and it tends to bring a spurious issue into the family, betraying the husband to maintain and educate children who are not his own.

The gradual advance of the female sex to an equality with the male sex, is visible in the laws of female succession that have been established at different times, and in different countries. It is not probable, that in any country women were early admitted to inherit land: they are too much despised among savages for so valuable a privilege. The fierceness and brutality of the ancient Romans in particular, unqualified the women to be their companions: it never entered their thoughts, that women should inherit land, which they cannot defend by the sword. But women came to be regarded in proportion as the national manners refined. The law prohibiting female succession in land, established in days of rusticity, was held to be rigorous and unjust when the Romans were more polished. Proprietors of land, such of them as had no sons, were disposed to evade the law, by ample provisions to their daughters, which rendered the land of little value to the collateral heir-male. To reform that abuse, as termed by the veterans, the *lex Voconia* was made, confining such provisions within moderate bounds: and this regulation continued in force, till regard for the female sex broke through every legal restraint, and established female succession in land, as formerly in moveables*.

The barbarous

* Justinian, or more properly the lawyers employ'd by him upon that absurd

barous nations who crush'd the Roman power, were not long in adopting the mild manners of the conquered: they admitted women to inherit land, and they exacted a double composition for injuries done to them. By the Salic law among the Franks, women were expressly prohibited to inherit land; but we learn from the forms of Marculfus, that this prohibition was in time eluded by the following solemnity. The man who wanted to put his daughter upon a footing with his sons, carried her before the commissary, saying, "My dear child, an ancient and impious custom bars a young woman from succeeding to her father: but as all my children equally are given me by God, I ought to love them equally; therefore, my dear child, my will is, that my effects shall divide equally between you and your brethren." In polished states, women are not excluded from succeeding even to the crown. Russia and Britain afford examples of women capable to govern, in an absolute as well as in a limited monarchy *.

What

compilation the Pandects, is guilty of a gross error, in teaching, that by the Twelve Tables males and females of the same degree succeeded equally to land. The *lex Voconia* (which see explain'd in *Alexandri ab Alexandro geniales dicit, lib. 6. cap. 15.*) vouches the contrary. And one cannot see without pain Justinian's error, not only adopted by an illustrious modern, but a cause assigned for it so refined and subtle as to go quite out of sight, *L'esprit de loix, liv. 27. chap. 1.* I venture to affirm, that subtle reasoning never had any influence upon a rough and illiterate people; and therefore, at the time of the Decemvirs, who composed the Twelve Tables of law, the subtle cause assigned by our author could not have been the motive, had the Decemvirs introduced female succession in land, which they certainly did not.

* The kingdom of Gurrah in Hindostan was governed by Queen Dargoutté, eminent for spirit and beauty. Small as that kingdom is, it contained about 70,000 towns and villages, the effect of long peace and prosperity. Being invaded by Asaph Can, not many years ago, the Queen, mounted on an elephant, led her troops to battle. Her son Rajah Bier Shaw, being wounded in the heat of action, was by her orders carried from the field. That accident having occasioned a general

What I have said, regards those nations only, where polygamy is prohibited. I take it for granted, that women are not admitted to inherit land where polygamy is lawful: they are not in such estimation as to be intitled to a privilege so illustrious.

Among the Hurons in North America, where the regal dignity is hereditary, and great regard paid to the royal family, the succession is continued through females, in order to preserve the royal blood untainted. When the chief dies, his son succeeds not, but his sister's son; who certainly is of the royal blood, whoever be the father: and when the royal family is at an end, a chief is elected by the noblest matron of the tribe. The same rule of succession obtains among the Natchez, a people bordering on the Mississippi; it being an article in their creed, That their royal family are children of the sun. On the same belief was founded a law in Peru, appointing the heir of the crown to marry his sister; which, equally with the law mentioned, preserved the blood of the sun in the royal family, and did not encroach so much upon the natural order of succession.

Female succession depends in some degree on the nature of the government. In Holland, all the children, male and female, succeed equally. The Hollanders live by commerce, which women are capable of as well as men. Land at the same time is so scanty in that country, as to render it impracticable to raise a family by engrossing a great estate in land; and there is nothing but the am-

ment. Where the law is, that a man must purchase his wife as one does a slave; it follows naturally, that he may purchase as many as he pleases. In the present instance, the Queen was left with no more but 300 horsemen. Adhar, who conducted her elephant, exhorted her to retire while it could be done with safety. The heroine rejected the advice. "It is true," said she, "we are overcome in battle; but not in honour. Shall I, for a lingering ignominious life, lose a reputation that has been my chief study! Let your gratitude repay now the obligations you owe me: pull out your dagger, and save me from slavery, by putting an end to my life."

bition

bition of raising a family that can move a man to prefer one of his children before the rest. The same law obtains in Hamburgh, for the same reasons. Extensive estates in land support great families in Britain, a circumstance unfavourable to younger children. But probably in London, and in other great trading towns, mercantile men take care to prevent the law, by making a more equal distribution of their effects among their children.

After traversing a great part of the globe with painful industry, will not one be apt to conclude, that originally females were every where despised, as they are at present among the savages of America; that wives, like slaves, were procured by barter; that polygamy was universal; and that divorce depended on the whim of the husband? Such conclusion however would be rash; for upon a more accurate scrutiny, an extensive country is discovered, where polygamy never was in fashion, and where women were from the beginning courted and honoured as among the most polished nations. But the reader is humbly requested to suspend his curiosity, till he peruse the following sketch, concerning the progress of manners, which appears to be the proper place for that curious and interesting subject.

We proceed now to a capital article in the progress of the female sex; which is, to trace the different degrees of restraint imposed upon married women in different countries, and at different times in the same country; and to assign the causes of these differences. Where luxury is unknown, and where people have no wants but what are suggested by uncorrupted nature, men and women live together with great freedom, and with great innocence. In Greece anciently, even young women of rank ministered to men in bathing.

“ While these officious tend the rites divine,

“ The last fair branch of the Nestorian line,

“ Sweet

"Sweet Polycasté, took the pleasant toil
"To bath the Prince, and pour the fragrant oil (a).
Men and women among the Spartans bathed promiscuously, and
wrestled together stark naked. Tacitus reports, that the Ger-
mans had not even seperate beds, but lay promiscuously upon
reeds or heath along the walls of the house. The same custom
prevails even at present among the temperate Highlanders of Scot-
land; and is not quite worn out in New England. A married
woman is under no confinement, because no man thinks of an
act so irregular as to attempt her chastity. In the Caribbee islands
adultery was unknown, till European Christians made settlements
there. At the same time, there scarce can be any fewel for jealousy,
where men purchase their wives, put them away at pleasure, and
even lend them to a friend. But when by ripening sensibility a
man puts a value on the affections of his wife, and on her attach-
ment to him, jealousy commences; jealousy of a rival in her af-
fections. Jealousy accordingly is a symptom of an increasing es-
teem for the female sex; and that passion is visibly creeping in
among the natives of Virginia. It begins to have a real founda-
tion, when inequality of rank and of riches takes place. Men of
opulence study pleasure: married women become objects of a cor-
rupted taste; and often fall a sacrifice, where morals are imper-
fect, and the climate favourable to animal love. Greece is a deli-
cious country, the people handsome; and when the ancient Greeks
made the greatest figure, they were extremely defective in morals.
They became jealous of their honour and of rivals; which
prompted them, according to the rough manners of those times,
to exclude women from society with men. Their women accor-

(a) *Odyssey*, book 3. See also book 8. line 491.

dingly were never seen in public; and if my memory serve me, an accidental interview of a man and a woman on the public street brings on the catastrophe in a Greek tragedy. In *Hecuba*, a tragedy of Euripides, the Queen excuses herself for declining to visit Polyestor, saying, "that it is indecent for a woman to look a man in the face." In the *Electra* of Sophocles, Antigone is permitted by her mother Jocasta to take a view of the Argian army from a high tower: an old man who accompanies her, being alarmed at seeing some females pass that way, and afraid of censure, prays Antigone to retire; "for," says he, "women are prone to detraction; and to them the merest trifle is a fruitful subject of conversation *." Spain is a country that scarce yields to Greece in fineness of climate; and the morals of its people in the dark ages of Christianity, were not more pure than those of Greece. By a law of the Visigoths in Spain, a surgeon was prohibited to take blood from a free woman, except in presence of her husband or nearest relations. By the Salic law (b), he who squeezes the hand of a free woman shall pay a fine of 15 golden shillings. In the fourteenth century, it was a rule in France, that no married woman ought to admit a man to visit her in absence of her husband. Female chastity must at that time have been extremely feeble, when so little trust was reposed in the fair sex.

To treat women in that manner, may possibly be necessary, where they are in request for no end but to gratify animal love. But where they are intended for the more elevated purposes, of being

* Women are not prone to detraction unless when denied the comforts of society. The censure of Sophocles is probably just with respect to his countrywomen, because they were lock'd up. Old maids have the character with us of being prone to detraction; but that holds not unless they retire from society.

(a) Tit. 22.

friends and companions, as well as affectionate mothers, a very different treatment is proper. Locks and spies will never answer; for these tend to debase their minds, to corrupt their morals, and to render them contemptible. By gradual openings in the more delicate senses, particularly in all the branches of the moral sense, chastity, one of these branches, acquires a commanding influence over females; and when they are treated with humanity, becomes their ruling principle. In that refined state, women are trusted with their own conduct, and may safely be trusted: they make delicious companions, and uncorruptible friends; and that such at present is generally their case in Britain, I am bold to affirm. Anne of Britany, wife to Charles VIII. and to Lewis XII. Kings of France, introduced the fashion of ladies appearing publicly at court. This fashion was introduced much later in England: even down to the Revolution, women of rank never appeared in the streets without a mask. In Scotland, the veil, or plaid, continued long in fashion, with which every woman of rank was covered when she went abroad. That fashion has not been laid aside above forty years. In Italy, women were much longer confined than in France; and in Spain the indulging them with some liberty is but creeping into fashion at present. In Abyssinia polygamy is prohibited; and married women of fashion have by custom obtained the privilege of visiting their friends, tho' not much with the good-will of many husbands. It were to be wished, that a veil could be drawn over the following part of their history. The growth of luxury and sensuality, undermining every moral principle, renders both sexes equally dissolute: wives in that case deserve to be again lock'd up; but the time of such severity is past. Then indeed it becomes indecent for the two sexes to bathe promiscuously. The men in Rome, copying the Greeks, plunged together into the same bath, and became such proficient in assu-

rance, that men and women did the same (a). Hadrian prohibited that indecent custom. Marcus Antoninus renewed the prohibition; and Alexander Severus, a second time: but to so little purpose, that even the primitive Christians made no difficulty to follow the custom: such appetite there is for being *nudus cum nuda*, when justified by fashion. This custom withstood even the thunder of general councils; and was not dropt till people became more decent, in appearance at least.

In days of innocence, when modesty is the ruling passion of the female sex, we find great frankness in external behaviour; for women who are above suspicion are little solicitous about appearances. At the same period, and for the same reason, we find great looseness in writing; witness the Queen of Navarre's tales. In the capital of France at present, chastity, far from being practised, is scarce admitted to be a female virtue. But people who take much freedom in private, are extremely circumspect in public: no indecent expression nor insinuation is admitted, even into their plays or other writings. In England the women are less corrupted than in France; and for that reason are not so scrupulous with respect to decency in writing.

Hitherto of the female sex in temperate climes, where polygamy is prohibited. Very different is their condition in hot climes, which inflame animal love in both sexes equally. In the hot regions of Asia, where polygamy is indulged, and wives are purchased for gratifying the carnal appetite merely, it is vain to think of restraining them otherwise than by locks and bars, after having once tasted enjoyment. Where polygamy is indulged, the body is the only object of jealousy; not the mind, as there can be no mutual affection between a man and his instruments of sensual

(a) Plutarch, Life of Cato.

pleasure. And if women be so little virtuous as not to be safely trusted with their own conduct, they ought to be lock'd up; for there is no just medium between absolute confinement and absolute freedom. The Chinese are so jealous of their wives, as even to lock them up from their relations; and so great is their diffidence of the female sex in general, that brothers and sisters are not permitted to converse together. When women are permitted to go abroad, they are shut up in a close sedan into which no eye can penetrate. The intrigues carried on by the wives of the Chinese Emperor, and the jealousy that reigns among them, render them unhappy. But luckily, as women are little regarded where polygamy is indulged, their ambition and intrigues give less disturbance to the government, than in the courts of European princes. The ladies of Hindostan cover their heads with a gauze veil, even at home, which they lay not aside except in presence of their nearest relations. A Hindoo buys his wife; and the first time he is permitted to see her without a veil, is after marriage in his own house. In several hot countries, women are put under the guard of eunuchs as an additional security; and black eunuchs are commonly preferred for their ugliness. But as a woman, deprived of the society of men, is apt to be inflamed even with the appearance of a man, some jealous nations, refining upon that circumstance, employ old maids, termed *duennas*, for guarding their women. In the city of Moka, in Arabia Felix, women of fashion never appear on the street in day-light; but it is a proof of manners refined above those in neighbouring countries, that they are permitted to visit one another in the evening. If they find men in their way, they draw aside to let them pass. A French surgeon being called by one of the King of Yeman's chief officers, to cure a rheumatism which had seized two of his wives, was permitted to handle the parts affected; but he could not get a sight of their faces.

I proceed to examine more minutely the manners of women, as resulting from the degree of restraint they are under in different countries. In the warm regions of Asia, where polygamy is indulged, the education of young women is extremely loose, being calculated for the sole end of animal pleasure. They are accomplished in such graces and allurements as tend to inflame the sensual appetite: they are taught vocal and instrumental music, with various dances that cannot stand the test of decency: but no culture is bestowed on the mind, no moral instruction, no improvement of the rational faculties; because such education, which qualifies them for being virtuous companions to men of sense, would inspire them with abhorrence at the being made prostitutes. In a word, so corrupted are they by vicious education, as to be unfit objects of any desire but what is merely sensual. The Asiatic ladies are not even trusted with the management of household affairs, which would afford opportunities for infidelity. In Persia, says Chardin, the ladies are not permitted, more than children, to chuse their own dress: no lady knows in the morning what gown she is to wear that day. The education of young women in Hindostan is less indecent. They are not taught music nor dancing, which are reckoned fit only for ladies of pleasure: they are taught all the graces of external behaviour, particularly to converse with spirit and elegance: they are taught also to sew, to embroider, and to dress with taste. Writing is neglected; but they are taught to read, that they may have the consolation of studying the Alcoran; which they never open, nor would understand if they did. Notwithstanding such care in educating Hindostan ladies, their manners, by being shut up in a seraglio, become extremely loose; the most refined luxury of sense, joined with idleness, or with reading love-tales, still worse than idleness, cannot fail to vitiate the minds of persons deprived of liberty, and to prepare them for every sort of intemperance. The wives and concubines of grandees

dees in Constantinople are permitted sometimes to walk abroad for air and exercise. A foreigner stumbling accidentally on a knot of them, about forty in number, attended with black eunuchs, was in the twinkling of an eye seized by a brisk girl, with the rest at her heels: she accosted him with loose amorous expressions, attempting at the same time to expose his nakedness. Neither threats nor intreaties availed him against such vigorous assailants; nor could the vehemence of their curiosity be moderated, by representing the shame of a behaviour so grossly immodest. An old Janizary, standing at a little distance, was amazed: his Mahometan bashfulness would not suffer him to lay hands upon women; but with a Stentorian voice he roared to the black eunuchs, that they were guardians of prostitutes, not of modest women; and urging them to free the man from such harpies. — All in vain (a).

Very different are female manners in temperate climes, where polygamy is prohibited, and women are treated as rational beings. These manners however depend in some measure upon the nature of the government. As many hands are at once employ'd in the different branches of republican government, and still a greater number by rotation, the males, who have little time to spare from public business, feel nothing of that languor and weariness which to the idle make the most frivolous amusements welcome. Married women live retired at home, managing family-affairs, as their husbands do those of the state: whence it is, that simplicity of manners is more the tone of a republic, than of any other government. Such were the manners of the female sex during the flourishing periods of the Greek and Roman commonwealths; and such are their manners in Switzerland and in Holland. In a monarchy, government employs but a few hands; and those who

(a) Observations on the religion, laws, &c. of the Turks.

are not occupied with public business, give reins to gallantry, and to other desires that are easily gratified. Women of figure, on the other hand, corrupted by opulence and superficial education, are more ambitious to captivate the eye than the judgement; and are fonder of lovers than of friends. Where a man and a woman thus disciplined meet together, they soon grow particular: the man is idle, the woman frank; and both equally addicted to pleasure. Such commerce must in its infancy be disguised under the appearance of virtue and religion: the mistress is exalted into a deity, the lover sinks into a humble votary; and this artificial relation produces a bombast sort of love, with sentiments that soar high above nature. Duke John de Bourbonnois, ann. 1414, caused it to be proclaimed, that he intended an expedition to England with sixteen knights, in order to combat the like number of English knights, for glorifying the beautiful angel he worshipped. René, styled *King of Sicily and Jerusalem*, observes, in writing upon tournaments, that they are highly useful in furnishing opportunities to young knights and esquires to display their prowess before their mistresses. He adds, "that every ceremony regarding tournaments is contrived to honour the ladies. It belongs to them to inspect the arms of the combatants, and to distribute the rewards. A knight or esquire who defames any of them is beat and bruised till the injured lady condescend to intercede for him." Remove once a female out of her proper sphere, and it is easy to convert her into a male. James IV. of Scotland, in all tournaments, professed himself knight to Anne Queen of France. She summoned him to prove himself her true and valorous champion, by taking the field in her defence against Henry VIII. of England. And, according to the romantic gallantry of that age, the Queen's summons was thought to have been his chief motive in declaring war against Henry his brother-in-law. The famous Gaston de Foix, who commanded the French troops
at

at the battle of Ravenna, rode from rank to rank, calling by name the officers, and even some private men, recommending to them their country and their honour; adding, "that he would see what they would perform for the love of their mistresses." During the civil wars in France, when love and gallantry were carried to a high pitch, Monsieur de Chatillon, ready to engage in a battle, tied to his arm a garter of Mademoiselle de Guérchi, his mistress.

But when unlawful commerce between the sexes turns common, and consequently familiar, the bombast style appears ridiculous, and the sensual appetite is gratified with very little ceremony. Nothing of love remains but the name; and as animal enjoyment without love is a very low pleasure, it soon sinks into disgust when confined to one object. What is not found in one, is fondly expected in another; and the imagination, roving from object to object, finds no gratification but in variety. An attachment to a woman of virtue or of talents appears absurd: true love is laughed out of countenance; and men degenerate into brutes. Women, on the other hand, regarding nothing but sensual enjoyment, become so careless of their infants, as even, without blushing, to employ mercenary nurses*. Such a course of life cannot fail to

sink

* Les femmes d'un certain état en France trouvent qu'elles perdent trop à faire des enfans, et à cause de cela même, la plupart vivent célibataires, dans le sein même du mariage. Mais si l'envie de se voir perpétuer dans une branche de descendants, les porte à se conformer aux vœux de l'hymen, la population, dans cette classe, n'en est pas plus avancée, parce que leur délicatesse rend inutile leur propagation; car, parmi les femmes du premier et second rang en France, combien y en a-t-il qui nourrissent leurs enfans? Il seroit facile de les compter. Ce devoir indispensable de mere, a cessé chez nous d'en être un. *Les Intérêts de la France*, vol. 1. p. 234. — [In English thus: "The women of a certain rank in France find that they lose too much by childbearing; and for that reason, even though

sink them into contempt: marriages are dissolved as soon as contracted; and the state is frustrated of that improvement in morals and manners, which is the never-failing product of virtuous love. A state enriched by conquest or commerce declines gradually into luxury and sensual pleasure: manners are corrupted, decency banished, and chastity becomes a mere name. What a scene of rank and dissolute pleasure is exhibited in the courts of Alexander's successors, and in those of the Roman emperors!

Gratitude to my female readers, if I shall be honoured with any, prompts me to conclude this sketch with a scene that may afford them instruction, and cannot fail of being agreeable; which is, the figure a woman is fitted for making in the matrimonial state, where polygamy is excluded. Matrimony among savages, having no object but propagation and slavery, is a very humbling state for the female sex: but delicate organization, great sensibility, lively imagination, with sweetness of temper above all, qualify women for a more dignified society with men; which is, to be their bosom-friends and companions. In the common course of European education, young women are trained to make an agreeable figure, and to behave with decency and propriety: very little culture is bestowed on the head; and still less on the heart, if it be not the art of hiding passion. Education so slight and superficial is far from seconding the purpose of nature, that of making women fit companions for men of sense. Due cultivation of the female mind,

though married, live in a state of celibacy. But population is not advanced, even by those who, from a desire of seeing themselves perpetuated in their descendants, conform to the purpose of marriage; for their delicacy counterbalances their fertility. How few of the first and second rank of women in France suckle their children? It would be easy to count the number. This indispensable duty of a mother has now ceased to be one with us."—As such woful neglect of education is the fruit of voluptuousness, we may take it for granted, that the same obtains in every opulent and luxurious capital.

would

would add greatly to the happiness of the males, and still more to that of the females. Time runs on; and when youth and beauty vanish, a fine lady, who never entertained a thought into which an admirer did not enter, finds in herself a lamentable void, occasioning discontent and peevishness. But a woman who has merit, improved by virtuous and refined education, retains in her decline an influence over the men, more flattering than even that of beauty: she is the delight of her friends, as formerly of her admirers.

Admirable would be the effects of such refined education, contributing no less to public good than to private happiness. A man, who at present must degrade himself into a fop or a coxcomb in order to please the women, would soon discover, that their favour is not to be gained but by exerting every manly talent in public and in private life; and the two sexes, instead of corrupting each other, would be rivals in the race of virtue. Mutual esteem would be to each a school of urbanity; and mutual desire of pleasing would give smoothness to their behaviour, delicacy to their sentiments, and tenderness to their passions.

Married women in particular, destin'd by nature to take the lead in educating their children, would no longer be the greatest obstruction to good education, by their ignorance, frivolity, and disorderly manner of living. Even upon the breast, infants are susceptible of impressions *; and the mother hath opportunities

* May not a habit of cheerfulness be produced in an infant by being trained up among cheerful people? An agreeable temper is held to be a prime qualification in a nurse. Such is the connection between the mind and body as that the features of the face are commonly moulded into an expression of the internal disposition; and is it not natural to think, that an infant in the womb may be affected by the temper of its mother? Its tender parts makes it susceptible of the slightest impressions. When a woman is breeding, she ought to be doubly careful of her temper; and in particular to indulge no ideas but what are cheerful, and no sentiments but what are kindly.

without end of instilling into them good principles, before they are fit for a male tutor. Coriolanus, who made a capital figure in the Roman republic, never returned from war without meriting marks of distinction. Others behaved valliantly, in order to acquire glory: he behaved valiantly, in order to give pleasure to his mother. The delight she took in hearing him praised, and her weeping for joy in his embraces, made him in his own opinion the happiest person in the universe. Epaminondas accounted it his greatest felicity, that his father and mother were still alive to behold his conduct, and enjoy his victory at Leuctra. In a Latin dialogue about the causes that corrupted the Roman eloquence, injudiciously ascribed to Tacitus, because obviously it is not his style, the method of education in Rome, while it flourished as a commonwealth, is described in a lively manner. I shall endeavour to give the sense in English, because it chiefly concerns the fair sex. "In that age, children were suckled, not in the hut of a mercenary nurse, but by the chaste mother who bore them. Their education during nonage was in her hands; and it was her chief care to instil into them every virtuous principle. In her presence, a loose word or an improper action were strictly prohibited. She superintended, not only their serious studies, but even their amusements; which were conducted with decency and moderation. In that manner the Gracchi, educated by Cornelia their mother, and Augustus, by Attia his mother, appeared in public with untainted minds; fond of glory, and prepared to make a figure in the world." In the expedition of the illustrious Bertrand du Guesclin against Peter the Cruel, King of Castile, the governor of a town, upon being summoned to give it up, made the following answer, "That they might be conquered, but would never tamely yield; that their fathers had taught them to prefer a glorious death before a dishonourable life; and that their mothers had not only educated them in
" these

"these sentiments, but were ready to put in practice the lessons they had inculcated." Let the most profound politician say, what more efficacious incentive there can be to virtue and manhood, than the behaviour of the Spartan matrons, flocking to the temples, and thanking the gods, that their husbands and sons had died gloriously, fighting for their country. In the war between Lacedæmon and Thebes, the Lacedæmonians having behaved ill, the married men, as Plutarch reports, were so ashamed of themselves, that they durst not look their wives in the face. What a glorious prize is here exhibited to be contended for by the female sex!

By such refin'd education, love would take on a new form, that which nature inspires for making us happy, and for softening the distresses of chance: it would fill deliciously the whole soul with tender amity, and mutual confidence. The union of a worthy man with a frivolous woman can never, with all the advantages of fortune, be made comfortable: how different the union of a virtuous pair, who have no aim but to make each other happy! Between such a pair emulation is reversed, by an ardent desire in each to be surpassed by the other.

Cultivation of the female mind is not of great importance in a republic, where men pass little of their time with women. Such cultivation where polygamy is indulged, would to them be a great misfortune, by opening their eyes to their miserable condition. But in an opulent monarchy where polygamy is prohibited, female education is of high importance, not singly with respect to private happiness, but with respect to the society in general.

of Gathie, the governor of a town, upon being summoned to give an answer, made the following answer, "That they might be contented, but would never yield; that their fathers had taught them to prefer a glorious death before a dishonourable life; and that their mothers had not only educated them in

A P P E N D I X.

Concerning Propagation of Animals, and Care of their Offspring.

THE natural history of animals with respect to pairing, and care of their offspring, is susceptible of more elucidation than could regularly be introduced into the sketch itself, where it makes but a single argument. Loth to neglect a subject that eminently displays the wisdom and benevolence of Providence, I gladly embrace the present opportunity, however slight, to add what further occurs upon it. Buffon, in many large volumes, bestows scarce a thought on that favourite subject; and the neglect of our countrymen Ray and Derham is still less excusable, considering that to display the conduct of Providence was their sole purpose in writing on natural history.

The instinct of pairing is bestow'd on every species of animals to which it is necessary for rearing their young; and on no other species. All wild birds pair: but with a remarkable difference between such as place their nests on trees, and such as place them on the ground. The young of the former, being hatched blind, and without feathers, require the nursing care of both parents till they be able to fly. The male feeds his mate on the nest, and cheers her with a song. As soon as the young are hatched, singing yields to a more necessary occupation, that of providing food for a numerous issue, a task that requires both parents.

Eagles and other birds of prey build on trees, or on other inaccessible spots. They not only pair, but continue in pairs all the year

year round ; and the same pair procreate year after year. This at least is the case of eagles : the male and female hunt together, unless during incubation, during which time the female is fed by the male. A greater number than a single pair never are seen in company.

Gregarious birds pair, in order probably to prevent discord in a society confined to a narrow space. This is the case particularly of pigeons and rooks. The male and female sit on the eggs alternately, and divide the care of feeding their young.

Partridges, plovers, pheasants, peafowl, grouse, and other kinds that place their nests on the ground, have the instinct of pairing ; but differ from such as build on trees in the following particular, that after the female is impregnated, she completes her task without needing any help from the male. Retiring from him, she chooses a safe spot for her nest, where she can find plenty of worms and grass-seed at hand. And her young, as soon as hatched, take foot, and seek food for themselves. The only remaining duty incumbent on the dam is, to lead them to proper places for food, and to call them together when danger impends. Some males, provoked at the desertion of their mates, break the eggs if they stumble on them. Eider ducks pair like other birds that place their nests on the ground ; and the female finishes her nest with down plucked from her own breast. If the nest be destroy'd for the down, which is remarkably warm and elastic, she makes another nest as before. If she be robb'd a second time, she makes a third nest ; but the male furnishes the down. A lady of spirit observed, that the Eider duck may give a lesson to many a married woman, who is more disposed to pluck her husband than herself. The black game never pair : in spring the cock on an eminence crows, and claps his wings ; and all the females within hearing instantly resort to him.

Pairing birds, excepting those of prey, flock together in February,
in

in order to chuse their mates. They soon disperse; and are not seen afterward but in pairs.

Pairing is unknown to quadrupeds that feed on grass. To such it would be useless; as the female gives suck to her young while she herself is feeding. If M. Buffon deserve credit, the roe-deer are an exception. They pair, though they feed on grass, and have but one litter in a year.

Beasts of prey, such as lions, tigers, wolves, pair not. The female is left to shift for herself and for her young; which is a laborious task, and often so unsuccessful as to shorten the life of many of them. Pairing is essential to birds of prey, because incubation leaves the female no sufficient time to hunt for food. Pairing is not necessary to beasts of prey, because their young can bear a long fast. Add another reason, that they would multiply so fast by pairing as to prove troublesome neighbours to the human race.

Among animals that pair not, males fight desperately about a female. Such a battle among horned cattle is finely described by Lucretius. Nor is it unusual for seven or eight lions to wage bloody war for a single female.

The same reason that makes pairing necessary for gregarious birds, obtains with respect to gregarious quadrupeds; those especially who store up food for winter, and during that season live in common. Discord among such would be attended with worse consequences than even among lions and bulls, who are not confined to one place. The beavers, with respect to pairing, resemble birds that place their nests on the ground. As soon as the young are produced, the males abandon their stock of food to their mates, and live at large; but return frequently to visit them while they are suckling their young.

Hedge-hogs pair as well as several of the monkey-kind. We are not well acquainted with the natural history of these animals;

mals; but it would appear that the young require the nursing care of both parents.

Seals have a singular economy. Polygamy seems to be a law of nature among them, as a male associates with several females. The sea-turtle has no occasion to pair, as the female concludes her task by laying her eggs in the sand. The young are hatched by the sun; and immediately crawl to the sea.

In every other branch of animal economy concerning the continuance of the species, the hand of Providence is equally conspicuous. The young of pairing birds are produced in the spring, when the weather begins to be comfortable; and their early production makes them firm and vigorous before winter, to endure the hardships of that rigorous season. Such early production is in particular favourable to eagles, and other birds of prey; for in the spring they have plenty of food, by the return of birds of passage.

Tho' the time of gestation varies considerably in the different quadrupeds that feed on grass, yet the female is regularly delivered early in summer, when grass is in plenty. The mare admits the stallion in summer, carries eleven months, and is delivered the beginning of May. The cow differs little. A sheep and a goat take the male in November, carry five months, and produce when grass begins to spring. These animals love short grass, upon which a mare or a cow would starve*. The rutting-season of the red deer is the end of September, and beginning of October: it continues for three weeks, during which time the male runs from female to female without intermission. The female

* I have it upon good authority, that ewes pasturing in a hilly country pitch early on some snug spot, where they may drop their young with safety. And hence the risk of removing a flock to a new field immediately before delivery: many lambs perish by being dropped in improper places.

brings

brings forth in May, or beginning of June; and the female of the fallow deer brings forth at the same time. The she-ass is in season beginning of summer; but she bears twelve months, which fixes her delivery to summer. Wolves and foxes copulate in December: the female carries five months, and brings forth in April, when animal food is as plentiful as at any other season; and the she-lion brings forth about the same time. Of this early birth there is one evident advantage, hinted above: the young have time to grow so firm as easily to bear the inclemencies of winter.

Were one to guess what probably would be the time of rutting, summer would be named, especially in a cold climate. And yet to quadrupeds who carry but four or five months, that economy would be pernicious, throwing the time of delivery to an improper season for warmth, as well as for food. Wisely is it ordered, that the delivery should constantly be at the best season for both.

Gregarious quadrupeds that store up food for winter, differ from all other quadrupeds with respect to the time of delivery. Beavers copulate the end of autumn, and bring forth in January, when their granary is full. The same economy probably obtains among all other quadrupeds of the same kind.

One rule takes place among all brute animals, without a single exception, That the female never is burdened with two litters at the same time. The time of gestation is so unerringly calculated by nature, that the young brood upon hand can provide for themselves before another brood comes on. Even a hare is not an exception, tho' many litters are produced in a year. The female carries thirty or thirty-one days; but she suckles her young only twenty days, after which they provide for themselves, and leave her free to a new litter.

The care of animals to preserve their young from harm is a beautiful instance of Providence. When a hind hears the hounds, she puts herself in the way of being hunted, and leads them away

way from her fawn. The lapwing is no less ingenious: if a person approach, she flies about, retiring always from her nest. A partridge is extremely artful: she hops away, hanging a wing as if broken; lingers till the person approach, and hops again. A hen, timid by nature, is bold as a lion in defence of her young: she darts upon every creature that threatens danger. The roe-buck defends its young with resolution and courage. So doth a ram; and so do many other quadrupeds.

It is observed by an ingenious writer (a), that nature sports in the colour of domestic animals, in order that men may the more readily distinguish their own. It is not easy to say, why colour is more varied in such animals, than in those which remain in the state of nature: I can only say, that the cause assigned is not satisfactory. One is seldom at a loss to distinguish one animal from another; and Providence never interposes to vary the ordinary course of nature, for an end so little necessary as to make the distinction still more obvious. Such interposition would beside have a bad effect, by encouraging inattention and indolence.

The foregoing particulars are offered to the public as hints merely: may it not be hoped, that they will excite curiosity in those who relish natural history? The field is rich, tho' little cultivated; and I know no other branch of natural history that opens finer views into the conduct of Providence.

(a) Pennant.

ached make but a poor figure upon a subject that has been fearfully discussed by the greatest genius of the present age (a).

I begin with external appearance, being the first thing that draws attention. The human countenance hath a greater variety of expressions than that of other animals, and some persons differ widely from the generality in their expressions. The same variety is observable in human gestures; and the same peculiarity in particular actions, as that of putting on or taking off a hat: some men are known even by the sound of their feet.

Progress of MANNERS.

Whole nations are distinguishable by the same peculiarities. **T**here are peculiarities in the appearance, in the expressions, in the actions, of some persons, which, in opposition to the manners of the generality, are termed *their manners*. Such peculiarities in the bulk of a nation, by which it differs from other nations, or from itself at different periods, are termed *the manners of that nation*. Manners therefore signify a mode of behaviour peculiar to a certain person, or to a certain nation. The term is not applied to mankind in general; except perhaps in contradistinction to other beings.

Manners are distinguished from morals; but in what respect has not been clearly explained. Do not the same actions relate to both? Certainly; but in different respects: an action considered as right or wrong, belongs to morals; considered as characteristic of a person, or of a people, it belongs to manners.

Manners peculiar to certain tribes and to certain governments, fall under other branches of this work. The intention of the present sketch is, to trace out the manners of nations, in the different stages of their progress, from infancy to maturity. I am far from regretting, that manners produced by climate, by soil, and by other permanent causes, fall not under my plan: I should indeed

deed make but a poor figure upon a subject that has been learnedly discussed by the greatest genius of the present age (a).

I begin with external appearance, being the first thing that draws attention. The human countenance hath a greater variety of expressions than that of any other animal; and some persons differ widely from the generality in these expressions. The same variety is observable in human gestures; and the same peculiarity in particular persons, so as to be known by their manner of walking, or even by so slight an action as that of putting on or taking off a hat: some men are known even by the sound of their feet. Whole nations are distinguishable by the same peculiarities. And yet there is less variety in looks and gestures, than the different tones of mind would produce, were men left to the impulses of pure nature: man, an imitative animal, is prone to copy others; and by imitation, external behaviour is nearly uniform among those who study to be agreeable; witness people of fashion in France. I am acquainted with a blind man, who, without moving his feet, is constantly balancing from side to side, excited probably by some internal impulse. Had he been endowed with eyesight, he would have imitated the manners of others. I rest upon these outlines: to enter fully into the subject would be an endless work; disproportioned at any rate to the narrowness of my plan.

Dress must not be omitted, because it enters into external appearance. Providence hath clothed all animals that are unable to clothe themselves. Man can clothe himself; and he is endowed beside with an appetite for dress, no less natural than an appetite for food. That appetite is proportioned in degree to its use: in cold climates it is vigorous; in hot climates, extremely faint.

(a) Montesquieu.

Savages must go naked till they learn to cover themselves; and they soon learn where covering is necessary. The Patagonians, who go naked in a bitter-cold climate, must be woefully stupid. And the Picts, a Scotch tribe, who, it is said, continued naked down to the time of Severus, did not probably much surpass the Patagonians in the talent of invention.

Modesty is another cause for clothing: few savages expose the whole of the body without covering. It gives no high idea of Grecian modesty, that at the Olympic games people wrestled and run races stark naked.

There is a third cause for clothing, which is, the pleasure it affords. A fine woman, seen naked once in her life, is a desirable object; desire being inflamed by novelty. But let her go naked for a month; how much more charming will she appear, when dressed with propriety and elegance! Cloathing is so essential to health, that to be less agreeable than nakedness would argue an incongruity in our nature. Savages probably at first thought of cloathing as a protection only against the weather; but they soon discovered a beauty in dress: men led the way, and women followed. Such savages as go naked, paint their bodies, excited by the same fondness for ornament, that our women shew in their party-coloured garments. Among the Jews, the men wore earrings as well as the women (*a*). When Media was governed by its own kings, the men were sumptuous in dress: they wore loose robes, floating in the air; had long hair covered with a rich bonnet, bracelets, chains of gold, and precious stones: they painted their faces, and mixed artificial hair with that of nature. As authors are silent about the women, they probably made no figure in that kingdom, being shut up, as at present, in seraglios. Very

(*a*) Exod. xxiii. 2.

different was the case of Athenian ladies, after polygamy was banished from Greece. They consumed the whole morning at the toilette; employing paint, and every drug for cleaning and whitening the skin; they laid red even upon their lips, and took great care of their teeth: their hair, made up in buckles with a hot iron, was perfumed and spread upon the shoulders: their dress was elegant, and artfully contrived to set off a fine shape. Such is the influence of appetite for dress: vanity could not be the sole motive, as Athenian ladies were never seen in public. We learn from St Gregory, that women in his time dressed their heads extremely high; environing them with many tresses of false hair, disposed in knots and buckles, so as to resemble a regular fortification. Josephus reports, that the Jewish ladies powdered their hair with gold dust; a fashion that was carried from Asia to Rome. The first writer who mentions white powder for the hair, the same we use at present, is L'Etoile, in his journal for the year 1593. He relates, that nurses walked the streets of Paris curled and powdered. That fashion spread by degrees through Europe. For many years after the civil wars in France, it was the fashion in Paris to wear boots and spurs with a long sword: a gentleman was not in full dress without these accoutrements. The sword continues an article of dress, tho' it distinguishes not a gentleman from his valet. To show that a taste for dress and ornament is deeply rooted in human nature, savages display that taste upon the body, having no covering to display it upon. Seldom is a child left to nature: it is deprived of a testicle, a finger, a tooth; or its skin is engraved with figures.

Cloathing hath no slight influence, even with respect to morals. I venture to affirm, at the hazard of being thought paradoxical, that nakedness is more friendly to chastity than covering. Adultery is unknown among savages, even in hot climates where they have scarce any covering. A woman dressed with taste is a more
desirable

desirable object than one who always goes naked. Dress beside gives play to the imagination, which pictures to itself many secret beauties, that vanish when rendered familiar by sight. If a lady accidentally discover half a leg, imagination is instantly inflamed, tho' an actress appearing in breeches is beheld with indifference: a naked Venus makes not such an impression, as when a garter only is discovered. In Sparta, men and women lived together without any reserve: public baths were common to both; and in certain games they danced and combated together naked as when born. In a later period, the Spartan dames were much corrupted; occasioned, as authors say, by a shameful freedom of intercourse between the sexes. But remark, that corruption was not confined to the female sex, men having degenerated as much from their original manhood as women from their original chastity; and I have no difficulty to maintain, that gold and silver, admitted contrary to the laws of Lycurgus, were what corrupted both sexes. Opulence could not fail to have the same effect there that it has every where; which is to excite luxury and sensuality. The Spartans accordingly, shaking off austerity of manners, abandoned themselves to pleasure: the most expensive furniture, the softest beds, superb tapestry, precious vases, exquisite wines, delicious viands, were not now too delicate for an effeminate Spartan, once illustrious for every manly virtue. Lycurgus understood human nature better than the writers do who carp at him. It was his intention, to make his countrymen soldiers, not whining lovers: and he justly thought, that familiar intercourse between the sexes would confine their appetites within the bounds of nature; an useful lesson to women of fashion in our days, who expose their nakedness in order to attract and enflame lovers. What justifies this reasoning is, the ascendant that Spartan dames had over their husbands while the laws of Lycurgus were in vigour: they in effect ruled the state as well as their own families. Such a-

scendant

ascendant cannot be obtained nor preserved but by strict virtue: a woman of loose manners may be the object of loose desire; but seldom will she gain an ascendant over any man, and never over her husband. Among no people was there more freedom of intercourse than among the ancient Germans: males and females slept promiscuously round the walls of their houses; and yet we never read of an attempt upon a married woman. The same holds true of the Scotch highlanders.

Cleanliness is an article in external appearance. Whether it be inherent in the nature of man, or only a refinement of polished nations, may at first sight appear doubtful. What pleads for the former is, that cleanliness is remarkable in several nations that have made little progress in the arts of life. The savages of the Caribbee islands, once a numerous tribe, were remarked by writers as neat and cleanly. In the island Otaheite, or King George's island, both sexes are cleanly: they bathe frequently, never eat nor drink without washing before and after, and their garments as well as their persons are kept free of spot or blemish. Ammianus Marcellinus, describing the Gauls, says, that they were cleanly; and that even the poorest women were never seen with dirty garments. The negroes, particularly those of Ardrah in the slave-coast, have a scrupulous regard to cleanliness. They wash morning and evening, and perfume themselves with aromatic herbs. In the city of Benin, in Guinea, women are employ'd to keep the streets clean; and in that respect they are not outdone by the Dutch. In Corea, people mourn three years for the death of their parents; during which time they never wash. Dirtiness must appear dismal to that people, as to us *. But instances are

Many animals are remarkable for cleanliness. Beavers are so, and so are rats. This must be natural. Tho' a taste for cleanliness is not remarkable in dogs, yet like men they learn to be cleanly.

no less numerous that favour the other side of the question. Amminianus Marcellinus reports of the Huns, that they wore the same coat till it fell to pieces with dirt and rottenness. Plan Carpin, who visited the Tartars anno 1246, says, "That they never wash face nor hands; that they never clean a dish, a pot, nor a garment; that, like swine, they make food of every thing, not excepting the vermin that crawl on them." The present people of Kamikotka answer to that description in every article. The nastiness of North-American savages, in their food, in their cabins, and in their garments, passes all conception. As they never change their garments till they fall to rags, nor ever think of washing them, they are eat up with vermin. The Esquimaux and many other tribes are equally nasty.

As cleanness requires attention and industry, the cleanliness of some savages must be the work of nature; and the dirtiness of others must proceed from indolence counteracting nature. In fact, cleanliness is agreeable to all; and nastiness disagreeable: no person prefers dirt; and even those who are the most accustomed to it, are pleased with a cleanly appearance in others. It is true, that a taste for cleanness, like that for order, for symmetry, for congruity, is extremely faint during its infancy among savages. Its strongest antagonist is indolence, which savages indulge to excess: the great fatigue they undergo in hunting, makes them fond of ease at home; and dirtiness, when once habitual, is not easily conquered. But cleanliness improves gradually with manners, and makes a figure in every industrious nation. Nor is a taste for cleanness bestow'd on man in vain: its final cause is conspicuous, cleanness being extremely wholesome, and nastiness no less unwholesome*.

Thus

* The plague, pestilential fevers, and other putrid diseases, were more frequent

in

Thus it appears, that a taste for cleanness is inherent in our nature. I say more: cleanliness is evidently a branch of propriety, and consequently a self-duty. The performance is rewarded with approbation; and the neglect is punished with contempt (a). A taste for cleanness is not equally distributed among all men; nor indeed is any branch of the moral sense equally distributed: and if by nature one person be more cleanly than another, a whole nation may be so. I judge that to be the case of the Japanese, so finically clean as to find fault even with the Dutch for dirtiness. Their inns are not an exception, nor their little houses, in which water is always at hand for washing after the operation. I judged it to be also the case of the English, who, high and low, rich and poor, are remarkable for cleanliness all the world over; and I have often amused myself with so singular a resemblance between islanders, removed at the greatest distance from each other. But I was forced to abandon the resemblance, upon a discovery that the English have not always been so cleanly as at present. Many centuries ago, as in Europe formerly than at present; especially in great cities, where multitudes were crowded together in small houses, and narrow streets. Paris, in the days of Henry IV. occupied not the third part of its present space, and yet contained nearly the same number of inhabitants; and in London the houses are much larger, and the streets wider, than before the great fire, 1666. There is also a remarkable alteration in point of diet. Formerly, people of rank lived on salt meat the greater part of the year: at present, fresh meat is common all the year round. Pot-herbs and roots are now a considerable article of food: above London in particular the consumption at the Revolution was not the fifth part of what it is now. Add the great consumption of tea and sugar, which I am told by physicians to be no inconsiderable antiseptics. But the chief cause of all is cleanliness, which is growing more and more universal, especially in the city of London. In Constantinople, putrid diseases reign as much as ever; not from unhealthiness in the climate, but from the narrowness and nastiness of the streets.

(a) Elements of Criticism, chap. 10.

recorded in monkish history, one cause of the aversion the English had to the Danes, was their cleanliness: they combed their hair, and put on a clean shirt once a-week. And the celebrated Erasmus, who visited England in the reign of Henry VIII. complains of the nastiness and slovenly habits of its people; ascribing to that cause the frequent plagues which at that time infested them. "Their floors," says he, "are commonly of clay strewed with rushes, under which lies unmolested a collection of beer, grease, fragments, bones, spittle, excrements of dogs and cats, and of every thing that is nauseous (a)." A change so extraordinary in the taste and manners of the English, rouses our curiosity; and I flatter myself that the following cause will be satisfactory. A savage, remarkably indolent at home, tho' not insensible of his dirtiness, cannot rouse up activity sufficient to attempt a serious purgation; and would be at a loss where to begin. The industrious, on the contrary, are improved in neatness and propriety by the art or manufacture that constantly employs them: they are never reduced to purge the stable of Augeas; for being prone to action, they suffer not dirt to rest unmolested. Industrious nations accordingly, all the world over, are the most cleanly. Arts and industry had long flourished in Holland, where Erasmus was born and educated: the people were clean above all their neighbours, because they were industrious above all their neighbours; and upon that account the dirtiness of England could not fail to strike a Hollander. At the period mentioned, industry was as great a stranger to England as cleanliness: from which consideration, may it not fairly be inferred, that the English are indebted for their cleanliness to the great progress of industry among them in later times? If this inference hold, it places industry in an amiable light. The Spaniards, who

(a) Epist. 432.

are indolent to a degree, are to this day as dirty as the English were formerly. Madrid, their capital, is nauseously nasty: heaps of unmolested dirt in every street raise in that warm climate a pestiferous steam, which threatens to knock down every stranger. A purgation was lately set on foot by royal authority. But people habituated to dirt are not easily reclaimed: to promote industry is the only effectual remedy *. The nastiness of the streets of Lisbon before the late earthquake was intolerable; and so is at present the nastiness of the streets of Cadiz.

Tho' industry be the chief promoter of cleanliness, yet it is seldom left to operate alone: other causes mix, some to accelerate the progress, some to retard it. The moisture of the Dutch climate has a considerable influence in promoting cleanliness; and joined with industry produces a surprising neatness and cleanliness among people of business: men of figure and fashion, who generally resort to the Hague, the seat of government, are not so cleanly. On the other hand, the French are less cleanly than the English, tho' not less industrious. But the lower classes of people, being in England more at their ease than in France, have a greater taste for living well, and in particular for keeping themselves clean.

A beard gives to the countenance a rough and fierce air, suited to the manners of a rough and fierce people. The same face without

* Till the year 1760, there was not a privy in Madrid, tho' it is plentifully supplied with water. The ordure, during night, was thrown from the windows into the street, where it was gathered into heaps. By a royal proclamation, privies were ordered to be built. The inhabitants, tho' long accustomed to an arbitrary government, resented this proclamation as an infringement of the common rights of mankind, and struggled vigorously against it. The physicians were the most violent opposers: they remonstrated, that if the filth was not thrown into the streets, a fatal sickness would ensue; because the putrescent particles of air, which the filth attracted, would be imbibed by the human body.

a beard appears milder; for which reason, a beard becomes unfashionable in a polished nation. Demosthenes the orator lived in the same period with Alexander the Great, at which time the Greeks began to leave off beards. A bust however of that orator, found in Herculaneum, has a beard; which must either have been done for him when he was young, or from reluctance in an old man to a new fashion. Barbers were brought to Rome from Sicily in the 454th year after the building of Rome. And it must relate to the time following that period, what Aulus Gellius says (a), that people accused of any crime were prohibited to shave their beards till they were absolved. From Hadrian, downward, the Roman Emperors wore beards. Julius Capitolinus reproaches the Emperor Verus for cutting his beard, at the instigation of a concubine. All the Roman generals wore beards in Justinian's time (b). When the Pope shaved his beard, it was reckoned a manifest apostasy by the Greek church; because Moses and Jesus Christ were always drawn with beards by the Greek and Latin painters. Upon the dawn of smooth manners in France, the beaus cut their beards into shapes, and curled their whiskers. That fashion produced a whimsical effect, viz. that men of gravity left off beards altogether: a beard in its natural shape was too fierce, even for them; and they could not for shame copy after the beaus. Language, when brought to any perfection among a polished people, may justly be considered as one of the fine arts; and in that view is handled above. But it belongs to the present sketch, considered as a branch of external behaviour. Every part of external behaviour is influenced by temper and disposition, and

(a) Lib. 3. cap. 4.

(b) Procopii Historia Vandalica, lib. 2.

language more than any other part. In Elements of Criticism (a) it is observed, that an emotion in many instances bears a resemblance to its cause. The like holds universally in all the natural sounds prompted by passion. Let a passion be bold, rough, cheerful, tender, or humble, still it holds, that the natural sound prompted by it is in the same tone; and hence the reason why these natural sounds are the same in all languages. Some slight resemblance of the same kind is discoverable in many artificial sounds. The language of a savage is harsh; of polite people, smooth; and of women, soft and musical. The tongues of savage nations abound in gutturals, or in nasals; yet one would imagine that such words, pronounced with difficulty, would be avoided by savages, as they are by children. But temper prevails, and suggests to savages harsh sounds, conformable to their roughness and cruelty. The Esquimaux have a language composed of the hardest gutturals; and the tongues of the northern European nations are not remarkably more smooth. The Scotch peasants are a frank and plain people; and their dialect is in the tone of their character. The Huron tongue hath stateliness and energy above most known languages; and the Hurons still retain a certain elevation of mind, which is more conformable to the majesty of their discourse, than to their present low condition. Thus the manners of a people may in some measure be gathered from their language. Nay manners may frequently be gathered from single words. The Hebrew word *LECHOM* signifies both *food* and *fighting*; and *TEREPH* signifies both *food* and *plunder*. *KARNB* signifies *to draw near to one*, and signifies also *to fight*. The Greek word *LEIA*, which signified originally *spoils procured by war or piracy*, came to signify *wealth*. And the great variety of Greek words

(a) Lib. 3. cap. 4.

(a) Chap. 2. part 6.

(b) Procopii Historia Vandalica, lib. 2.

signifying *good* and *better*, signified originally *strong* and *violent*.

Government, according to its different kinds, hath considerable influence in forming the tone of a language. Language in a democracy is commonly rough and coarse; in a republic, manly and plain; in a monarchy, courteous and insinuating; in despotism, imperious with respect to inferiors, and humble with respect to superiors. The government of the Greek empire is well represented in Justinian's edicts, termed *Novellæ Constitutiones*, the style of which is stiff, formal, and affectedly stately; but destitute of order, of force, and of ligament. About three centuries ago, Tuscany was filled with small republics, who spoke a dialect manly and plain. Its rough tones were purged off when united under the Great Duke of Tuscany; by which means the Tuscan dialect has arrived nearer to perfection than any other in Italy. The tone of the French language is well suited to the nature of its government: every man is politely submissive to those above him; and this tone forms the character of the language in general, so as even to regulate the tone of the few who have occasion to speak with authority. The freedom of the English government forms the manners of the people: the English language is accordingly more manly and nervous than the French, and abounds more with rough sounds. The Lacedæmonians of old, a proud and austere people, affected to talk with brevity, in the tone of command more than of advice; and hence the Laconic style, dry but masculine. The Attic style is more difficult to be accounted for: it was sweet and copious; and had a remarkable delicacy above the style of any other nation. And yet the democracy of Athens produced rough manners; witness the comedies of Aristophanes, and the orations of Eschines and Demosthenes. We are not so well acquainted with the Athenians as to account for the difference between their language and their manners:

manners: and are equally at a loss about the Russian tongue, which, notwithstanding the barbarity of the people, is smooth and sonorous. All that can be said is, that the operation of a general cause may be disturbed by particular circumstances. Languages resemble the tides: the influence of the moon, which is the general cause of tides, is in several instances overbalanced by particular causes acting in opposition.

There may be observed in some savage tribes, a certain refinement of language that might do honour to a polished people. The Canadians never give a man his proper name, in speaking to him. If he be a relation, he is addressed to in that quality: if a stranger, the speaker gives him some appellation that marks affection; such as, brother, cousin, friend.

From speech we advance to action. Man is naturally prone to motion; witness children, who are never at rest but when asleep. Where reason governs, a man restrains that restless disposition, and never acts without a motive. Savages have few motives to action when the belly is full: their huts require little industry; and their covering of skins, still less. Hunting and fishing employ all their activity. After much fatigue in hunting, rest is sweet; which the savage prolongs, having no motive to action till the time of hunting returns. Savages accordingly, like dogs, are extremely active in the field, and extremely indolent at home *. The savages

* *Quotiens bella non ineunt, non multum venatibus; plus per otium transigunt, dedit somno, ciboque. Fortissimus quisque ac bellicosissimus nihil agens, delegata domus et penatium et agrorum cura feminis femibusque, et infirmissimo cuique ex familia, ipsi he bent; mira diversitate naturæ, cum iidem homines sic ament inertiā, et oderint quietem. Tacitus, De moribus Germanorum, cap. 15. — [In English thus: "While not engaged in war, they do not often spend their time in "hunting, but chiefly in indolence, minding nothing but their sleep and food. "The bravest and most warlike among them, having nothing to do, pass the time*

" in

ges of the torrid zone are indolent above all others: they go naked; their huts cost them no trouble; and they never hunt except for vegetables, which are their only food. The Spaniards who first landed in Hispaniola, were surprised at the manners of the inhabitants. They are described as lazy, and without ambition; passing part of their time in eating and dancing, and the rest in sleep; having no great share of memory, and still less of understanding. The character given of these savages belongs to all, especially to savages in hot climates. The imperfection of their memory and judgement is occasioned by want of employment. The same imperfection was remarkable in the people of Paraguay, when under Jesuit government; of which afterward (a).

In early times, people lived in a very simple manner, ignorant of such habitual wants as are commonly termed luxury. Rebecca, Rachel, and the daughters of Jethro, tended their fathers flocks: they were really shepherdesses. Young women of fashion drew water from the well with their own hands. The joiner who made the bridal bed of Ulysses, was Ulysses himself (b). The Princess Nausicaa washes the family-cloaths; and the Princess her brothers, upon her return, unyoke the car, and carry in the cloaths (c). Queens, and even female deities, are employ'd in spinning (d). Is it from this fashion that young women in Eng-

“ in a sluggish stupidity, committing the care of the house, the family, and the culture of the lands, to women, old men, and to the most weakly. Such is the wonderful diversity of their nature, that they are at once the most indolent of beings, and the most impatient of rest.”]

(a) Book 2. sketch 1.

(b) Odysses, book 23.

(c) Book 6. & 7.

(d) Book 10.

land are denominated spinsters? Telemachus goes to council with no attendants but two dogs:

"Soon as in solemn form th' assembly sat,

"From his high dome himself descends in state;

"Bright in his hand a pond'rous jav'lin shin'd;

"Two dogs, a faithful guard, attend behind."

ODYSSEY, book 2.

Priam's car is yoked by his own sons, when he went to redeem from Achilles the body of his son Hector. Telemachus yokes his own car (a). Homer's heroes kill and dress their own victuals (b). Achilles entertaining Priam, as now mentioned, slew a snow-white sheep; and his two friends flea'd and dressed it. Achilles himself divided the roasted meat among all *.

Not to talk of gold, silver was scarce in England during the reign of the third Edward. Rents were paid in kind; and what money they had was locked up in the coffers of the great barons. Pieces of plate were bequeathed even by kings of England, so trifling in our estimation, that a gentleman of a moderate fortune would be ashamed to mention such in his will.

We next take under consideration the progress of such manners as are more peculiarly influenced by internal disposition; preparing the reader by a general view, before entering into particulars.

* Pope, judging it below the dignity of Achilles to act the butcher, suppresses that article, imposing the task upon his two friends. Pope, it would appear, did not consider, that from a lively picture of ancient manners proceeds one of the capital pleasures we have in perusing Homer.

(a) *Odyssey*, book 15.

(b) *Odyssey*, book 19. & 20.

Man is by nature a timid animal, having little ability to secure himself against harm; but he becomes bold in society, and gives vent to passion against his enemies. In the hunter-state, the daily practice of slaughtering innocent animals for food, hardens men in cruelty: they are worse than bears or wolves, being cruel even to their own kind. The calm and sedentary life of a shepherd tends to soften the harsh manners of hunters; and agriculture, requiring the union of many hands in one operation, inspires a taste for mutual good offices. But here comes in the hoarding appetite to disturb that auspicious commencement of civilization. Skilful husbandry, producing the necessaries of life in plenty, paves the way to arts and manufactures. Fine houses, splendid gardens, and rich apparel, are desirable objects: the appetite for property becomes headstrong, and to obtain gratification tramples down every obstacle of justice or honour (*a*). Differences arise, fomenting discord and resentment: war is raised, even among those of the same tribe; and while it was lawful for a man to take revenge at his own hand (*b*), that fierce passion swallow'd up all others. Inequality of rank and fortune fostered dissocial passions: witness pride in particular, which produced a custom, once universal among barbarians, of killing men, women, dogs, and horses, for serving a dead chieftain in the other world. Such complication of selfish and stormy passions, tending eagerly to gratification, and rendering society uncomfortable, cannot be stemmed by any human means other than wholesome laws: a momentary obstacle inflames desire; but perpetual restraint deadens even the most fervid passion. The authority of good government gave vigour to kindly affections; and appetite for society, which acts incessantly, tho' not violently, gave a currency to mu-

(*a*) See sketch 3.

(*b*) See Historical Law-tracts, tract 1.

tual good offices. A circumstance concurred to blunt the edge of dissocial passions: the first societies were small; and small states in close neighbourhood produce discord and resentment without end: the junction of many such states into a great kingdom, remove people farther from their enemies, and render them more gentle (a). In that situation, men have leisure and sedateness to relish the comforts of social life: they find that selfish and turbulent passions are subversive of society; and through fondness for society, they patiently undergo the severe discipline of restraining passion, and smoothing manners. Violent passions that disturb the peace of society have subsided, and are now seldom heard of: humanity is in fashion, and social affections prevail. Men improve in urbanity by conversing with women; and however selfish at heart, they conciliate favour, by assuming an air of disinterestedness. Selfishness thus refined becomes an effectual cause of civilization. But what follows? Turbulent and violent passions are buried, never again to revive; leaving the mind totally ingrossed by self-interest. In the original state of hunters and fishers, there being little connection among individuals, every man minds his own concerns, and selfishness governs. The discovery that hunting and fishing are best carried on in company, promotes some degree of society in that state: it gains ground in the shepherd-state, and makes a capital figure where husbandry and commerce flourish. Private concord is promoted by social affection; and a nation is prosperous in proportion as the *amor patriæ* prevails. But wealth, acquired whether by conquest or commerce, is productive of luxury and sensuality. As these increase, social affections decline, and at last vanish. This is visible in every opulent city that has long flourished in extensive commerce. Selfishness becomes the ruling passion: friendship is no more; and even blood-relation is

(a) See this more fully handled, book 2. sketch 1.

little regarded. Every man studies his own interest ; and love of gain and of sensual pleasure are idols worshipped by all. And thus in the progress of manners, men end as they begun : selfishness is no less eminent in the last and most polished state of society, than in the first and most savage state.

From a general view of the progress of manners, we descend to particulars. And the first scene that presents itself is, cruelty to strangers, extended in process of time against members of the same tribe. Anger and resentment are predominant in savages, who never think of smothering passion. But this character is not universal : some tribes are remarkable for humanity, as mentioned in the first sketch. Anger and resentment formed the character of our European ancestors, and made them fierce and cruel. The Goths were so prone to blood, that in their first inroads into the Roman territories they massacred man, woman, and child. Procopius reports, that in one of these inroads they left Italy thin of inhabitants. They were however an honest people ; and by the polish they received in the civilized parts of Europe, they became no less remarkable for humanity, than formerly for cruelty. Totila, their king, having mastered Rome after a long and bloody siege, permitted not a single person to be killed in cold blood, nor the chastity of any woman to be attempted. One cannot without horror think of the wanton cruelties exercised by the Tartars against the nations invaded by them under Gengizcan and Timor Bec.

A Scythian, says Herodotus, presents the king with the heads of the enemies he has killed in battle ; and the man who brings not a head, gets no share of the plunder. He adds, that many Scythians clothe themselves with the skins of men, and make use of the skulls of their enemies to drink out of. Diodorus Siculus reports of the Gauls, that they carry home the heads of their enemies slain in battle ; and after embalming them, deposit them in chests as their chief trophy ; bragging of the fumes offered for these heads

heads by the friends of the deceased, and refused. In similar circumstances men are the same all the world over. The scalping of enemies, in daily use among the North-American savages, is equally cruel and barbarous.

No savages are more cruel than the Greeks and Trojans were, as described by Homer; men butchered in cold blood, towns reduced to ashes, sovereigns exposed to the most humiliating indignities, no respect paid to age nor to sex. The young Adrastus (a), thrown from his car, and lying on his face in the dust, obtained quarter from Menelaus. Agamemnon upbraided his brother for lenity. "Let none from destruction escape, not even the lisping infant in the mother's arms: all her sons must with Ilium fall, and on her ruins unburied remain." He pierced the suppliant with his spear; and setting his foot on the body, pulled it out. Hector, having stript Patroclus of his arms, drags the slain along, vowing to lop the head from the trunk, and to give the mangled corse a prey to the dogs of Troy. And the seventeenth book of the Iliad is wholly employ'd in describing the contest about the body between the Greeks and Trojans. Beside the brutality of preventing the last duties from being performed to a dead friend, it is a low scene, unworthy of heroes. It was equally brutal in Achilles to drag the corse of Hector to the ships, tied to his car. In a scene between Hector and Andromache (b), the treatment of vanquished enemies is pathetically described; sovereigns massacred, and their bodies left a prey to dogs and vultures; sucking infants dash'd against the pavement; ladies of the first rank forc'd to perform the lowest acts of slavery. Hector doth not dissemble, that if Troy were conquered, his poor wife would be condemned to draw water like the vilest slave. Hecuba, in Eur-

(a) Book 6, of the Iliad.

(b) Iliad, book 6.

ripides, laments, that she was chained like a dog at Agamemnon's gate; and the same savage manners are described in many other Greek tragedies. Prometheus makes free with the heavenly fire, in order to give life to man. As a punishment for bringing rational creatures into existence, the gods decree, that he be chained to a rock, and abandoned to birds of prey. Vulcan is introduced by Eschylus rattling the chain, nailing one end to a rock, and the other to the breast-bone of the criminal. Who but an American savage can at present behold such a spectacle and not be shocked at it? A scene representing a woman murdered by her children, would be hissed by every modern audience; and yet that horrid scene was represented with applause in the *Electra* of Sophocles. Stobæus reports a saying of Menander, that even the gods cannot inspire a soldier with civility: no wonder that the Greek soldiers were brutes and barbarians, when war was waged, not only against the state, but against every individual. At present, humanity prevails among soldiers as among others; because we make war only against a state, not against individuals. The Greeks are the less excusable for their cruelty, as they appear to have been sensible that humanity is a cardinal virtue. Barbarians are always painted by Homer as cruel; polished nations as tender and compassionate:

"Ye gods! (he cried) upon what barren coast,

"In what new region is Ulysses tost;

"Possess'd by wild barbarians fierce in arms,

"Or men whose bosom tender pity warms?"

ODYSSEY, book 13. 241-5.

Cruelty is inconsistent with true heroism; and accordingly very little of the latter is discoverable in any of Homer's warriors. So much did they retain of the savage character, as, even without blushing,

blushing, to fly from an enemy superior in bodily strength. Diomedes, who makes an illustrious figure in the fifth book of the Iliad, retires when Hector appears: "Diomedes beheld the chief, and shuddered to his inmost soul." Antilochus, son of Nestor, having slain Melanippus (a), rushed forward, eager to seize his bright arms. But seeing Hector, he fled like a beast of prey who shuns the gathering hinds. And the great Hector himself shamefully turns his back upon the near approach of Achilles: "Periphetes, endowed with every virtue, renowned in the race, great in war, in prudence excelling his fellows, gave glory to Hector, covering the chief with renown." One would expect a fierce combat between these two bold warriors. Not so. Periphetes stumbling, fell to the ground; and Hector was not ashamed to transfix with his spear the unresisting hero.

In the same tone of character, nothing is more common among Homer's warriors than to insult a vanquish'd foe. Patroclus, having beat Cebriones to the ground with a huge stone, derides his fall in the following words.

"Good heav'ns! what active feats yon artist shows,

"What skilful divers are our Phrygian foes!

"Mark with what ease they sink into the sand.

"Pity! that all their practice is by land."

The Greeks are represented (b) one after another stabbing the dead body of Hector: "Nor stood an Argive near the chief who inflicted not a wound. Surely now, said they, more easy of access is Hector, than when he launched on the ships brands of devouring fire."

(a) Book 15.

(b) Book 22.

When such were the manners of warriors at the siege of Troy, it is no wonder that the heroes on both sides were not less intent on stripping the slain than on victory. They are every where represented as greedy of spoil.

The Jews did not yield to the Greeks in cruelty. It is unnecessary to give instances, as the historical books of the Old Testament are in the hands of every one. I shall select one instance for a specimen, dreadfully cruel without any just provocation: "And David gathered all the people together, and went to Rabbah, and fought against it, and took it. And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick-kiln: and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon (a)."

That cruelty was predominant among the Romans, is evident from every one of their historians. Brutality to their offspring was conspicuous. Children were held, like cattle, to be the father's property: and so tenacious was the *patria potestas*, that if a son or daughter sold to be a slave was set free, he or she fell again under the father's power, to be sold a second time, and even a third time. The power of life and death over children was much less unnatural, while no public tribunal existed for punishing crimes. A son, being a slave, could have no property of his own. Julius Cæsar was the first who privileged a son to retain for his own use spoils acquired in war. When law became a lucrative profession, what a son gained in that way was declared to be his property. In Athens, a man had power of life and death over his children; but as they were not slaves, what they acquired belonged to themselves. So late as the days of Dioclesian, a son's mar-

(a) 2 Samuel, xii, 29.

riage did not dissolve the Roman *patria potestas* (a). But the power of selling children wore out of use (b). When powers so unnatural were given to men over their children, and exercised so tyrannically as to make a law necessary prohibiting the disinheriting of children, can there be any doubt of their cruelty to others? During the second triumvirate, horrid cruelties were every day perpetrated without pity or remorse. Antony, having ordered Cicero to be beheaded, and the head to be brought to him, viewed it with savage pleasure. His wife Fulvia laid hold of it, struck it on the face, uttered many bitter execrations, and having placed it between her knees, drew out the tongue, and pierced it with a bodkin. The delight it gave the Romans to see wild beasts set loose against one another in their circus, is a proof not at all ambiguous of their taste for blood, even at the time of their highest civilization. The Edile Scaurus sent at one time to Rome 150 panthers, Pompey 410, and Augustus 420, for the public spectacles. Their gladiatorial combats are not so clear a proof of their ferocity: the courage and address exerted in these combats gave a manly pleasure that balanced in some measure the pain of seeing these poor fellows cut and slash one another. And that the Romans were never cured of their itch for blood, appears from Caligula, Nero, and many other monsters, who governed the Romans from Augustus downward. There is no example in modern times of such monsters in France, tho' an absolute monarchy, nor even in Turkey.

Ferocity was in the Roman empire considerably mollified by literature and other fine arts; but it acquired new vigour upon the irruption of the barbarous nations who crushed that empire. In the year 559, Clotaire, King of the Franks, burnt alive his son, with

(a) l. 1. Cod. cap. De patria potestate.

(b) l. 10. cod.

all his friends, because they had rebelled against him. Queen Bruneaud, being by Clotaire II. condemned to die, was dragged through the camp at a horse's tail till she gave up the ghost. The ferocity of European nations became altogether intolerable during the anarchy of the feudal system. Many peasants in the northern provinces of France, being sorely oppressed in civil wars carried on by the nobles against each other, turned desperate, gathered together in bodies, resolving to extirpate all the nobles. A party of them, anno 1358, forc'd open the castle of a knight, hung him up upon a gallows, violated in his presence his wife and daughters, roasted him upon a spit, compelled his wife and children to eat of his flesh, and terminated that horrid scene with massacring the whole family, and burning the castle. When they were asked, says Froissard, why they committed such abominable actions, their answer was, "That they did as they saw others do; and" "that all the nobles in the world ought to be destroy'd." The nobles, when they got the upper hand, were equally cruel. They put all to fire and sword; and massacred every peasant who came in the way, without troubling themselves to separate the innocent from the guilty. The Count de Ligny encouraged his nephew, a boy of fifteen, to kill with his own hand some prisoners who were his countrymen; in which, says Montrelet, the young man took great delight. How much worse than brutal must have been the manners of that age! for even a beast of prey kills not but when instigated by hunger. The third act of stealing from the lead-mines in Derby, was, by a law of Edward I. punished in the following manner: A hand of the criminal was nailed to a table; and in that state he was left without meat or drink, having no means for freedom but to employ the one hand to cut off the other. The barbarity of the English at that period made severe punishments necessary: but the punishment mentioned goes beyond severity; it is brutal cruelty. The barbarous treatment of

of the Jews during the dark ages of Christianity, gives pregnant evidence, that Christians were not short of Pagans in cruelty. Poison and assassination were most licentiously perpetrated, no farther back than the last century. Some pious men made vigorous efforts in more than one general council to have assassination condemned, as repugnant to the law of God; but in vain*.

I wish to soften the foregoing scene: it may be softened a little. Among barbarians, punishments must be sanguinary; as their bodies only are sensible of pain, not their minds.

The restoration of arts and sciences in Europe, followed with a reformation in religion, had a wonderful effect in sweetening manners, and promoting the interests of society. Of all crimes high treason is the most involved in circumstances, and upon that account the most difficult to be defined or circumscribed: at the same time, the influence of government upon its judges seldom permits a fair trial. And yet, for that crime are reserved the most exquisite torments. In England, the punishment is, to cut up the criminal alive, to tear out his heart, to dash it about his ears, and to throw it into the flames. The same punishment continues in form, not in reality: the heart indeed is torn out, but not till the criminal is strangled. Even the virulence of religious zeal is considerably abated. Savonarola was condemned to the flames as an impious impostor; but he was first privately strangled. The fine arts, which humanize manners, were in Italy at that time accelerating toward perfection. The famous Latimer was in England

* It required the ferocity and cruelty of a barbarous age to give currency to a Mahometan doctrine, That the sword is the most effectual means of converting men to a dominant religion. The establishment of the Inquisition will not permit me to say, that Christians never put in practice a doctrine so detestable: on the contrary, they surpass the Mahometans, giving no quarter to heretics, neither in this life, nor in that to come. The eternity of hell-torments is a doctrine no less inconsistent with the justice of the Deity, than with his benevolence.

condemned to be burnt for heresy : but bags of gunpowder were put under his arms, that he might be burnt with the least pain. Even Knox, a violent Scotch reformer, acknowledges, that Wishart was strangled before he was thrown into the flames for heresy. So bitter was the late persecution against the Jesuits, that not only were their persons proscribed, but in many places their books, not even excepting books upon mathematics, and other abstract subjects. That persecution resembled in many particulars the persecution against the knights-templars : fifty-nine of the latter were burnt alive : the former were really less innocent ; and yet such humanity prevails at present, that not a drop of Jesuit-blood has been shed. A bankrupt in Scotland, if he have not suffered by unavoidable misfortune, is by law condemned to wear a party-coloured garment. That law is not now put in execution, unless where a bankrupt deserves to be stigmatized for his culpable misconduct.

Whether the following late instance of barbarity do not equal any of those above mentioned, I leave to my readers. No traveller who visited Petersburg during the reign of the Empress Elisabeth can be ignorant of Madam Lapouchin, the great ornament of that court. Her intimacy with a foreign ambassador having brought her under suspicion of plotting with him against the government, she was condemned to undergo the punishment of the knout. At the place of execution she appeared in a genteel undress, which heightened her beauty. Of whatever indiscretion she might have been guilty, the sweetness of her countenance, and her composure, left not in the spectators the slightest suspicion of guilt. Her youth also, her beauty, her life and spirit pleaded for her. — But all in vain : she was deserted by all, and abandoned to furly executioners ; whom she beheld with astonishment, seeming to doubt whether such preparations were intended for her. The cloak that covered her bosom being pulled off, modesty took the alarm,

alarm, and made her start back: she turned pale, and burst into tears! One of the executioners stripp'd her naked to the waist, seized her by both hands, and threw her on his back, raising her some inches from the ground. The other executioner laying hold of her delicate limbs with his rough fists, put her in a posture for receiving the punishment. Then laying hold of the knout, a sort of whip made of a leathern strap, he retreated a few steps, and with a single stroke tore off a slip of skin from the neck downward, repeating his strokes till all the skin of her back was cut off in small slips. The executioner finished his task with cutting out her tongue; after which she was banished to Siberia*.

The native inhabitants of the island Amboyna are Malaysians. Those on the sea-coast are subject to the Dutch: those in the inland parts are declared enemies to the Dutch, and never give quarter. A Dutch captive, after being confined five days without food, is ripped up, his heart cut out, and the head, sever'd from the body, is preserved in spice for a trophy. Those who can show the greatest number of Dutch heads are the most honourable.

In early times, when revenge and cruelty trampled on law, people formed associations for securing their lives and their possessions. These were common in Scandinavia and in Scotland. They were also common in England during the Anglo-Saxon period, and for some ages after the Conquest. But instead of supporting justice, they contributed more than any other cause to a

* The present Empress has laid an excellent foundation for civilizing her people, which is a Code of laws, founded on principles of civil liberty, banishing slavery and torture, and expressing the utmost regard for the life, property, and liberty of all her subjects, high and low. Peter I. reformed many bad customs, but being rough in his own manners, he left the manners of his people as he found them. If this Empress happen to enjoy a long and prosperous reign, she may possibly accomplish the most difficult of all undertakings, that of polishing her people. No task is too arduous for a woman of such spirit.

narchy

narchy and confusion, the members protecting each other, even in robbery and murder. They were suppressed in England by a statute of Richard II.; and in Scotland by reiterated statutes. Roughness and harshness of manners are generally connected with cruelty; and the manners of the Greeks and Trojans are accordingly represented in the Iliad as remarkably rough and harsh. When the armies were ready to engage (a), Menestheus King of Athens, and Ulysses of Ithaca, are bitterly reproached by Agamemnon for lingering, while others were more forward. "Son of Peleus, he said, and thou versed in artful deceit, in mischief only wise, why trembling shrink ye back from the field; why wait till others engage in fight? You it became, as first in rank, the first to meet the flame of war. Ye first to the banquet are called when we spread the feast. Your delight is to eat, to regale, to quaff unstinted the generous wine." In the fifth book Sarpedon upbraids Hector for cowardice. And Tlepolemus, ready to engage with Sarpedon, attacks him first with reviling and scurrilous words. Because Hector was not able to rescue the dead body of Sarpedon from the Greeks, he is upbraided by Glaucus, Sarpedon's friend, in the following words. "Hector, tho' specious in form, distant art thou from valour in arms. Undeserved hast thou fame acquired, when thus thou shrinkest from the field. Thou sustaineest not the dreadful arm, not even the fight of godlike Ajax. Thou hast shunned his face in the fight: thou darest not approach his spear."

Rough and harsh manners produced slavery; and slavery fostered rough and harsh manners, by giving them constant exercise. The brutality of the Spartans to the Helots, their slaves, is a reproach to the human species. Beside the harshest usage, they were prevented from multiplying by downright murder and massacre.

(a) Book 4.

Why

Why did not such barbarity render the Spartans detestable, instead of being respected by their neighbours as the most virtuous people in Greece? There can be but one reason, that the Greeks were all of them cruel, the Spartans a little more perhaps than the rest. In Rome, a slave, chain'd at the gate of every great house, gave admittance to the guests invited to a feast: could any but barbarians behold such a spectacle without pain? If a Roman citizen was found murdered in his own house, his whole household-slaves, perhaps two or three hundred, were put to death without mercy, unless they could detect the murderer. Such a law, cruel and unjust, could never have been enacted among a people of any humanity.

Whence the rough and harsh manners of our West-Indian planters, but from the unrestrained licence of venting ill humour upon their negro slaves *? Why are carters a rugged set of men? Plainly because

* C'est de cet esclavage des negres, que les Crèoles tirent peut-être en partie un certain caractère, qui les fait paroître bizarres, fantasques, et d'une société peu goûtée en Europe. A peine peuvent-ils marcher dans l'enfance, qu'ils voient autour d'eux des hommes grands et robustes, destinés à deviner, à prévenir leur volonté. Ce premier coup d'œil doit leur donner d'eux-mêmes l'opinion la plus extravagante. Rarement exposés à trouver de la résistance dans leurs fantaisies même injustes, ils prennent un esprit de présomption, de tyrannie, et de mépris extrême, pour une grande portion du genre humain. Rien n'est plus insolent que l'homme qui vit presque toujours avec ses inférieurs; mais quand ceux-ci sont des esclaves, accoutumés à servir des enfans, à craindre jusqu'à des cris qui doivent leur attirer des châtimens, que peuvent devenir des maîtres qui n'ont jamais obéi, des méchans qui n'ont jamais été punis, des foux qui mettent des hommes à la chaîne?

Histoire Philosophique et Politique des établissemens des Européens dans les Deux Indes, t. 4, p. 201. — [In English thus: "It is from this slavery of the negroes, that the " Creoles derive in a great measure that character which makes them appear capricious and fantastical, and of a style of manners which is not relished in Europe. Scarcely have the children learned to walk, when they see around them " tall and robust men, whose province it is to guess their inclinations, and to prevent

because horses, their slaves, submit without resistance. An ingenious writer, describing Guiana in the southern continent of America, observes, that the negroes, who are more numerous than the whites, must be kept in awe by severity of discipline. And he endeavours to justify the practice; urging, that beside contributing to the safety of the white inhabitants, it makes the slaves themselves less unhappy. "Impossibility of attainment," says he, "never fails to annihilate desire of enjoyment; and rigid treatment, suppressing every hope of liberty, makes them peaceably submit to slavery." Sad indeed must be the condition of slaves, if harsh treatment contribute to make them less unhappy. Such reasoning may be relished by rough European planters, intent upon gain: I am inclined however to believe, that the harsh treatment of these poor people is more owing to the avarice of their masters, than to their own perverseness *. That slaves in all ages have been harshly treated, is a melancholy truth. One exception I know, and but one, which I gladly mention in honour of the Mandingo negroes. Their slaves, who are numerous, receive

vent their wishes. This first observation must give them the most extravagant opinion of themselves. From being seldom accustomed to meet with any opposition, even in their most unreasonable whims, they acquire a presumptuous and tyrannical disposition, and entertain an extreme contempt for a great part of the human race. None is so insolent as the man who lives almost always with his inferiors; but when these inferiors are slaves accustomed to serve infants, and to fear even their crying, for which they must suffer punishment, what can be expected of those masters who have never obeyed, profligates who have never met with chastisement, and madmen who load their fellow-creatures with chains?"

* In England slavery subsisted so late as the sixteenth century. A commission was issued by Queen Elisabeth, anno 1574, for enquiring into the lands and goods of all her bondmen and bondwomen in the counties of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and Glo'ster, in order to compound with them for their manumission or freedom, that they might enjoy their own lands and goods as free men.

very

very gentle treatment; the women especially, who are generally so well dressed as not to be distinguishable from those who are free.

Many political writers are of opinion, that for crimes instigated by avarice only, slavery for life and hard work, would be a more adequate punishment than death. I would subscribe to that opinion but for the following consideration, that the having such criminals perpetually in view, would harden the hearts of the spectators, and eradicate pity, a capital moral passion. Behold the behaviour of the Dutch in the island of Amboyna. A native who is found guilty of theft is deprived of his ears and nose, and made a slave for life. William Funnel, who was there anno 1705, reports, that 500 of these wretches were secured in prison, and never suffered to go abroad but in order to saw timber, to cut stone, or to carry heavy burdens. Their food is a pittance of coarse rice boiled in water, and their bed the hard ground. What is still worse, poor people who happen to run in debt are turned over to the servants of the East-India company, who send them to work among their slaves, with a daily allowance of two pence, which goes to the creditor. A nation must be devoid of bowels, who can establish such inhumanity by law. But time has rendered that practice familiar to the Dutch, so as to behold with absolute indifference, the multiplied miseries of their fellow-creatures. It appears indeed, that such a punishment would be more effectual than death to repress theft; but can any one doubt, that society would suffer more by eradicating pity and humanity, than it would gain by removing every one by death who is guilty of theft? At the same time, the Dutch, however cruel to the natives, are extremely complaisant to one another: seldom is any one of them punished but for murder: a small sum will procure pardon for any other crime.

A degree of coarseness and indelicacy is connected with rough

manners. The manners of the Greeks, as copied by Plautus and Terence from Menander and other Greek writers, were extremely coarse; such as may be expected in a people living among their slaves, without any society with virtuous women. The behaviour of Demosthenes and Eschines to each other in their public harangues, is wofully coarse. But Athens was a democracy; and a democracy, above all other governments, is rough and licentious. In the Athenian comedy, neither gods nor men are spared. The most respectable persons of the republic are ridiculed by name, in the comedies of Aristophanes, which wallow in looseness and detraction. In the third act of *Andromaché*, a tragedy of Euripides, Peleus and Menelaus, Kings of Thessaly and Sparta, fall into downright ribaldry; Menelaus swearing that he would not give up his victim, and Peleus threatening to knock him down with his staff. The manners of Jason, in the tragedy of *Medea* by Euripides, are wofully indelicate. With unparalleled ingratitude to his wife Medea, he, in her presence, makes love to the King of Corinth's daughter, and obtains her in marriage. Instead of shunning a person he had so deeply injured, he endeavours to excuse himself to her in a very sneaking manner, "that he was an exile like herself, without support; and that his marriage would acquire powerful friends to them and to their children." Could he imagine, that such frigid reasons would touch a woman of any spirit? But the most striking picture of indelicate manners, is exhibited in the tragedy of *Alcestes*. Admetus prevails upon Alcestes, his loving and beloved wife, to die in his stead. What a barbarian must the man be, who grasps at life upon such a condition? How ridiculous is the bombast flourish of Admetus, that, if he were Orpheus, he would pierce to hell, brave the three-headed Cerberus, and restore his wife to earth again! and how indecently does he scold his father, for refusing to die for him! What pretext could the monster have to complain of his father, when

when he himself was so disgracefully fond of life, as even to solicit his beloved spouse to die in his stead! What stronger instance, after all, would one require of indelicacy in the manners of the Greeks, than that they held all the world except themselves to be barbarians? In that particular, however, they are not altogether singular. Tho' the Tartars, as mentioned above, were foul feeders, and hoggishly nasty, yet they were extremely proud, despising, like the Greeks, every other nation. The people of Congo think the world to be the work of angels; except their own country, which they hold to be the handiwork of the supreme architect. The Greenlanders have a high conceit of themselves; and in private make a mock of the Europeans, or Kablunets, as they call them. Despising arts and sciences, they value themselves on their skill in catching seals, conceiving it to be the only useful art. They hold themselves to be the only civilized and well-bred people; and when they see a modest stranger, they say, "he begins to be a man;" that is, to be like one of themselves.

So coarse and indelicate were Roman manners, that whipping was a punishment inflicted on the officers of the army, not even excepting centurions (a). Doth it not show extreme grossness of manners, to express in plain words the parts that modesty bids us conceal? and yet this is common in Greek and Roman writers. In the Cyclops of Euripides there is represented a scene of the vice against nature, grossly obscene, without the least disguise. How wofully indelicate must the man have been, who could sit down gravely to compose such a piece! and how dissolute must the spectators have been, who could behold such a scene without hissing! Next to the indecency of exposing one's nudities in good company, is the talking of them without reserve. Horace is extremely obscene, and Martial no less. But I censure neither of

(a) Julius Capitolinus, in the life of Albinus.

them, and as little the Queen of Navarre for her tales; for they wrote according to the manners of the times. It is the manners I censure, not the writers. A woman taken in adultery was prostituted in the public street to all comers, a bell ringing the whole time. This abominable practice was abolished by the Emperor Theodosius (a).

The manners of Europe, before the revival of letters, were no less coarse than cruel. In the Cartularies of Charlemagne, judges are forbid to hold courts but in the morning, with an empty stomach. It would appear, that men in those days were not ashamed to be seen drunk, even in a court of justice. It was customary, both in France and Italy, to collect for sport all the strumpets in the neighbourhood, and to make them run races. Several feudal tenures give evidence of manners both low and coarse. Struvius mentions a tenure, binding the vassal, on the birth-day of his lord, to dance and fart before him. The cod-piece, which a few centuries ago made part of a man's dress, and which swelled by degrees to a monstrous size, testifies shamefully-coarse manners; and yet it was a modest ornament, compared with one used in France during the reign of Lewis XI. which was the figure of a man's privy parts worn upon the coat or breeches. In the same period, the judgement of Paris was a favourite theatrical entertainment: three women stark-naked represented the three goddesses, Juno, Venus, and Minerva. Nick-names, so common not long ago, are an instance of the same coarseness of manners; for to fix a nick-name on a man, is to use him with contemptuous familiarity. In the thirteenth century, many clergymen refused to administer the sacrament of the Lord's supper, unless they were paid for it *.

Swearing

(a) Socrates, Hist Eccl lib. 5 cap. 18.

* Corpus Christi tenentes in manibus, (says the canon), ac si dicerent, Quid mihi vultis

Swearing as an expletive of speech, is a violent symptom of rough and coarse manners. Such swearing prevails among all barbarous nations. Even women in Plautus swear fluently. Swearing prevailed in Spain and in France, till it was banished by polite manners. Our Queen Elisabeth was a bold swearer; and the English populace, who are rough beyond their neighbours, are noted by strangers for that vice. Tho' swearing in order to enforce an expression, is not in itself immoral; it is however hurtful in its consequences, rendering sacred names too familiar. God's beard, the common oath of William Rufus, suggests an image of our maker as an old man with a long beard. In vain have acts of parliament been made against swearing: it is easy to evade the penalty, by coining new oaths; and as that vice proceeds from an overflow of spirits, people in that condition brave penalties. Polished manners are the only effectual cure for that malady.

When a people begin to emerge out of barbarity, loud mirth and rough jokes come in place of rancour and resentment. About a century ago, it was usual for the servants and retainers of the court of session in Scotland, to break out into riotous mirth and uproar the last day of every term, throwing bags, dust, sand, or stones, all around. We have undoubted evidence of that disorderly practice from an act of the court, prohibiting it under a severe penalty, as dishonourable to the court, and unbecoming the civility requisite in such a place (a).

And this leads to the lowness of ancient manners; plainly distinguishable from simplicity of manners: the latter is agreeable, not the former. Among the ancient Egyptians, to cram a man

vultis dare, et ego eum vobis tradam? — [In English thus: "Holding the body of
" Christ in their hands, as if they said, What will you give me for this?"]

(a) Act of Sederunt, 21st February 1663.

was an act of high respect. Joseph, the King's first minister, in order to honour Benjamin above his brethren, gave him a five-fold mess (*a*). The Greeks in their feasts distinguished their heroes by a double portion (*b*). Ulysses cut a fat piece out of the chine of a wild boar for Demodocus the bard (*c*). The same respectful politeness is practised at present among the American savages; so much are all men alike in similar circumstances. Telemachus (*d*) complains bitterly of Penelope's suitors, that they were gluttons, and consumed his beef and mutton. The whole 14th book of the *Odyssey*, containing the reception of Ulysses by Eumæus the swine-herd, is miserably low. Manners must be both gross and low, where common beggars are admitted to the feasts of princes, and receive scraps from their hands (*e*). In Rome every guest brought his own napkin to a feast. A slave carried it home, filled with what was left from the entertainment. Sophocles, in his tragedy of *Iphigenia in Aulis*, represents Clytemnestra stepping down from her car, and exhorting her servants to look after her baggage, with the anxiety and minuteness of a lady's waiting-woman. Homer paints in lively colours the riches of the Phœacians, their skill in navigation, the magnificence of the king's court, of his palace, and of the public buildings. But, with the same breath, he describes Nausicaa, the king's daughter, travelling to the river on a waggon of greasy cloaths, to be washed there by her and her maids. Possibly it will be urged, that such circumstances, however low in our opinion, might appear other-

(*a*) Gen. xliii. 34.

(*b*) *Odyssey*, b. 8. v. 513. b. 15. v. 156.

(*c*) *Odyssey*, b. 8. v. 519.

(*d*) *Odyssey*, b. 2.

(*e*) See 17th & 18th books of the *Odyssey*.

wife to the Greeks. If they had appeared low to the Greeks, they would not have been introduced by their greatest poet. But what does this prove, other than that the Greeks were low in their manners? Their manners did not correspond to the delicacy of their taste in the fine arts. Nor can it be expected that they should correspond, when the Greeks were strangers to that polite society with women which refines behaviour, and elevates manners. The first kings in Greece, as Thucydides observes, were elective, having no power but to command their armies in time of war; which resembles the government that obtains at present in the isthmus of Darien. They had no written laws, being governed by custom merely. To live by plunder was held honourable; for it was their opinion, that the rules of justice are not intended for restraining the powerful. All strangers were accounted enemies, as among the Romans; and inns were unknown, because people lived at home, having very little intercourse even with those of their own nation. Inns were unknown in Germany; and to this day are unknown in the remote parts of the highlands of Scotland; but for an opposite reason, that hospitality prevailed greatly among the ancient Germans, and continues to prevail so much among our highlanders, that a gentleman takes it for an affront if a stranger pass his house. At a congress between Francis I. of France and Henry VIII. of England, among other spectacles for public entertainment, the two kings had a wrestling-match. Had they forgot that they were sovereign princes?

One would imagine war to be a soil too rough for the growth of civilization; and yet it is not always an unkindly soil. War between two small tribes is fierce and cruel: but a large state mitigates resentment, by directing it, not against individuals, but against the state in general. We know no enemies but those who are in arms: we have no resentment against others, but rather find

find a pleasure in treating them with humanity. Barbarity and cruelty, having thus in war few individuals for their objects, naturally subside; and magnanimity in their stead transforms soldiers from brutes to heroes. Some time ago, it was usual in France to demand battle; and it was held dishonourable to decline it, however unequal the match. Here was heroism without prudence; but in all reformation it is natural to go from one extreme to the other. While the King of England held any possessions in France, war was perpetual between the two nations, which was commonly carried on with more magnanimity than is usual between inveterate enemies. It became customary to give prisoners their freedom, upon a simple parole to return with their ransom at a day named. The same was the custom in the border wars between the English and Scots, before their union under one monarch. Both parties found their account equally in such honourable behaviour. Edward Prince of Wales, in a pitched battle against the French, took the illustrious Bertrand du Guesclin prisoner. He long declined to accept a ransom; but finding it whispered that he was afraid of that hero, he instantly set him at liberty without a ransom. This may be deemed impolitic or whimsical: but is love of glory less praise-worthy than love of conquest? The Duke of Guise, victor in the battle of Dreux, rested all night in the field of battle; and gave the Prince of Condé, his prisoner, a share of his bed, where they lay like brothers. The Chevalier Bayard, commander of a French army *anno* 1524, being mortally wounded in retreating from the Imperialists, placed himself under a tree, his face however to the enemy. The Marquis de Pescara, General of the Imperial forces, finding him dead in that posture, behaved with the generosity of a gallant adversary: he directed his body to be embalmed, and to be sent to his relations in the most honourable manner. Magnanimity and heroism, in which benevolence is an essential ingredient, are inconsistent with

with cruelty, perfidy, or any groveling passion. Never was gallantry in war carried to a greater height, than between the English and Scotch borderers before the crowns were united. The night after the battle of Otterburn, the victors and vanquished lay promiscuously in the same camp, without apprehending the least danger one from the other. The manners of ancient warriors were very different. Homer's hero, tho' superior to all in bodily strength, takes every advantage of his enemy; and never feels either compassion or remorse. The politic of the Greeks and Romans in war, was to weaken the state by plundering its territory, and destroying its people. Humanity with us prevails even in war. Individuals not in arms are secure, which saves much innocent blood. Prisoners were set at liberty upon paying a ransom; and by later improvements in manners, even that practice is left off, as too mercantile, a more honourable practice being substituted, viz. a cartel for exchange of prisoners. Humanity was carried to a still greater height, in our late war with France, by an agreement between the Duke de Noailles and the Earl of Stair, That the hospitals for the sick and wounded soldiers should be secure from all hostilities. The humanity of the Duke de Randan in the same war, makes an illustrious figure even in the present age, remarkable for humanity to enemies. When the French troops were compelled to abandon their conquests in the electorate of Hanover, their Generals every where burnt their magazines, and plundered the people. The Duke de Randan, who commanded in the city of Hanover, put the magistrates in possession of his magazines, requesting them to distribute the contents among the poor; and he was beside extremely vigilant to prevent his soldiers from committing acts of violence*. The necessity of

fortifying
 * Such kindness in an enemy from whom nothing is expected but mischief, is an illustrious instance of humanity. And a similar instance will not make the less

fortifying towns to guard from destruction the innocent and defenceless, affords convincing evidence of the savage cruelty that prevailed in former times. By the growth of humanity, such fortifications have become less frequent; and they serve no purpose at present but to defend against invasion; in which view a small fortification, if but sufficient for the garrison, is greatly preferable; being constructed at a much less expence, and having no mouths to provide for but the garrison only.

figure that it was done by a man of inferior rank. When Mons. Thurot, during our late war with France, appeared on the coast of Scotland with three armed vessels, the terror he at first spread, soon yielded to admiration inspired by his humanity. He paid a full price for every thing he wanted; and in general behaved with so much affability, that a countryman ventured to complain to him of an officer who had taken from him fifty or sixty guineas. The officer acknowledged the fact; but said, that he had divided the money among his men. Thurot ordered the officer to give his bill for the money, which, he said, should be stopped out of his pay, if they were so fortunate as to return to France. Compare this incident with that of the great Scipio, celebrated in Roman story, who restored a beautiful bride to the bridegroom, and it will not suffer by the comparison. Another instance is no less remarkable. One of his officers gave a bill upon a merchant in France, for the price of provisions purchased by him. Thurot having accidentally seen the bill, informed the countryman that it was of no value, reprimanded the officer bitterly for the cheat, and compelled him to give a bill upon a merchant who he knew would pay the money. At that very time, Thurot's men were in bad humour, and were disposed to mutiny. In such circumstances, would not Thurot have been excused, for winking at a fraud to which he was not accessory? But he acted all along with the strictest honour, even at the hazard of a mutiny. Common honesty to an enemy is not a common practice in war. Thurot was strictly honest in circumstances that made the exertion of common honesty an act of the highest magnanimity. These incidents ought to be held up to princes as examples of true heroism. War carried on in that manner, would, from desolation and horror, be converted into a fair field for acquiring true military glory, and for exercising every manly virtue. I feel the greatest satisfaction in paying this tribute of praise to the memory of that great man. He will be kept in remembrance by every true-hearted Briton, tho' he died fighting against us. But he died in the field of honour, fighting for his country.

In

In the progress of society there is commonly a remarkable period, when social and dissocial passions seem to bear equal sway, prevailing alternately. In the history of Alexander's successors, there are frequent instances of cruelty, equalling that of American savages; and instances no less frequent of gratitude, of generosity, and even of clemency, that betoken manners highly polished. Ptolemy of Egypt, having gained a complete victory over Demetrius, son of Antigonus, restored to him his equipage, his friends, and his domestics, saying, that "they ought not to make war for plunder, but for glory." Demetrius having defeated one of Ptolemy's Generals, was less delighted with the victory, than with the opportunity of rivalling his antagonist in humanity. The same Demetrius having restored liberty to the Athenians, was treated by them as a demi-god; and yet afterward, in his adversity, their gates were shut against him. Upon a change of fortune he laid siege to Athens, resolving to chastise that rebellious and ungrateful people. He assembled the inhabitants in the theatre, surrounding them with his army, as preparing for a total massacre. But their terror was short; he pronounced their pardon, and bestow'd on them 100,000 measures of wheat. Ptolemy, the same who is mentioned above, having at the siege of Tyre summoned Andronicus the governor to surrender, received a provoking and contemptuous answer. The town being taken, Andronicus gave himself over for lost: but the King, thinking it below his dignity to resent an injury against an inferior, now his prisoner, not only overlooked the affront, but courted Andronicus to be his friend. Edward the Black Prince is an instance of refined manners, breaking, like a spark of fire, through the gloom of barbarity. The Emperor Charles V. after losing 30,000 men at the siege of Metz, made an ignominious retreat, leaving his camp filled with sick and wounded, dead and dying. Tho' the war between him and the King of France was carried on with unusual

ranconr, yet the Duke of Guise, governor of the town, exerted in those barbarous times a degree of humanity that would make a splendid figure even at present. He ordered plenty of food for those who were dying of hunger, appointed surgeons to attend the sick and wounded, removed to the adjacent villages those who could bear motion, and admitted the remainder into the hospitals that he had fitted up for his own soldiers; those who recovered their health were sent home, with money to defray the expence of the journey.

In the period that intervenes between barbarity and humanity, there are not wanting instances of opposite passions in the same person, governing alternately; as if a man could this moment be mild and gentle, and next moment harsh and brutal. To vouch the observation, I beg leave to introduce two rival monarchs, who for many years distressed their own people, and disturbed Europe, viz. the Emperor Charles, and the French King Francis. The Emperor, driven by contrary winds on the coast of France, was invited by Francis, who happened to be in the neighbourhood, to take shelter in his dominions, proposing an interview at Aigues-Mortes, a sea-port town. The Emperor instantly repaired there in his galley; and Francis, relying on the Emperor's honour, visited him on shipboard, and was received with every expression of affection. Next day, the Emperor repaid the confidence reposed in him: he landed at Aigues-Mortes with as little precaution, and found a reception equally cordial. After twenty years of open hostilities, or of secret enmity, after having formally given the lie, and challenged each other to single combat, after the Emperor had publicly inveighed against Francis as void of honour, and Francis had accused the Emperor as murderer of his own son; such behaviour will scarce be thought consistent with human nature. But these monarchs lived in a period verging from cruelty to humanity; and such periods abound with surprising changes of temper
and

and conduct. In the present times, such changes are unknown. Conquest has not always the same effect upon the manners of the conquered. The Tartars who subdued China in the thirteenth century, adopted immediately the Chinese manners: the government, laws, customs, continued without variation. And the same happened upon their second conquest of China in the seventeenth century. The barbarous nations also who crushed the Roman empire, adopted the laws, customs, and manners of the conquered. Very different was the fate of the Greek empire when conquered by the Turks. That warlike nation introduced every where their own laws and manners: even at this day they continue a distinct people, as much as ever. The Tartars, as well as the barbarians who overthrew the Roman empire, were all of them rude and illiterate, destitute of laws, and ignorant of government. Such nations readily adopt the laws and manners of a civilized people, whom they admire. The Turks had laws, and a regular government; and the Greeks, when subdued by them, were reduced by luxury and sensuality to be objects of contempt, not of imitation.

Manners are deeply affected by persecution. The forms of procedure in the Inquisition, enable the inquisitors to ruin whom they please. A person accused is not confronted with the accuser: every sort of accusation is welcome, and from every person: a child, a common prostitute, one branded with infamy, are reputable witnesses: a son is compelled to give evidence against his father, and a woman against her husband. Nay the persons accused are compelled to inform against themselves, by guessing what sin they may have been guilty of. Such odious, cruel, and tyrannical proceedings, made all Spain tremble: every man distrust his neighbour, and even his own family: a total end was put to friendship, and to social freedom. Hence the gravity and reserve of a people, who have naturally all the vivacity of a temperate

rate

rate clime and bountiful soil *. Hence the profound ignorance of that people, while other European nations are daily improving in every art and in every science. Human nature is reduced to its lowest state, when governed by superstition clothed with power.

We proceed to another capital article in the history of manners, viz. the selfish and social branches of our nature, by which manners are greatly influenced. Selfishness prevails among savages; because corporeal pleasures are its chief objects, and of these every savage is perfectly sensible. Benevolence and kindly affection are too refined for a savage, unless of the simplest kind, such as the ties of blood. While artificial wants were unknown, selfishness made no figure: the means of gratifying the calls of nature were in plenty; and men who are not afraid of ever being in want, never think of providing against it; and far less do they think of coveting what belongs to another. But men are not long contented with simple necessities: an unwearied appetite to be more and more comfortably provided, leads them from necessities to conveniences, and from these to every luxury of life. Avarice turns headstrong; and locks and bars, formerly unknown, become necessary to protect individuals from the rapacity of their neighbours. When the goods of fortune, money in particular, come to be prized, selfishness soon displays itself. In Madagascar, a man who makes a present of an ox or a calf, expects the value in return: and scruples not to say, "You my friend, I your friend; you no my friend, I no your friend; I salamanca you, you salamanca me." Salamanca means, the making a present. Admiral Watson being introduced to the King of Baba, in Madagascar, was asked by his Majesty, what presents he had brought. Hence the custom, universal among barbarians, of always accost-

* The populace of Spain, too low game for the inquisition, are abundantly chearful, perhaps more so than those of France.

ing a king, or any man of high rank, with presents. The peculiar excellence of man above all other animals, is the capacity he has of improving by education and example. In proportion as his faculties refine, he acquires a relish for society, and finds a pleasure in benevolence, generosity, and in every other kindly affection, far above what selfishness can afford. How agreeable is this scene! Alas, too agreeable to last for ever. Opulence and luxury inflame the hoarding appetite; and selfishness at last prevails as it did originally. The selfishness however of savages differs from that of pampered people. Luxury, confining a man's whole views to himself, admits not of friendship, and scarce of any other social passion. But where a savage takes a liking to a particular person, the whole force of his social affection being directed to a single object, becomes extremely fervid. Hence the unexampled friendship between Achilles and Patroclus in the Iliad; and hence many such friendships among savages.

But there is much more to be said of the influence of opulence on manners. Rude and illiterate nations are tenacious of their laws and manners; for they are governed by custom, which is more and more rivetted by length of time. A people, on the contrary, who are polished by having passed through various scenes, are full of invention, and constantly thinking of new modes. Manners in particular can never be stationary, in a nation which is refined by prosperity and the arts of peace. Good government will advance men to a high degree of civilization; but the very best government will not preserve them from corruption, after becoming rich by prosperity. Opulence begets luxury, and enervates the appetite for sensual pleasure. The appetite, when inflamed, is never confined within moderate bounds, but clings to every object of gratification, without regard to propriety or decency. When Septimius Severus was elected Emperor, he found on the roll of causes depending before the judges in Rome no fewer

fewer than three thousand accusations of adultery. From that moment he abandoned all thoughts of attempting a reformation. Love of pleasure is similar to love of money: the more they are indulged the more they are inflamed. Polygamy is an incentive to the vice against nature; one act of incontinence leading to others, without end. When the Sultan Achmet was deposed at Constantinople, the people breaking into the house of one of his favourites, found not a single woman. It is reported of the Algerines, that in many of their seraglios there are no women. For the same reason, polygamy is far from preventing adultery, a truth finely illustrated in Nathan's parable to David. What judgement then are we to form of the opulent cities London and Paris, where pleasure is the ruling passion, and where riches are coveted as instruments of sensuality? What is to be expected but a pestiferous corruption of manners? Selfishness, ingrossing the whole soul, eradicates patriotism, and leaves not a cranny for social virtue. If in that condition men abstain from robbery or from murder, it is not love of justice that restrains them, but dread of punishment. Babylon is arraigned by Greek writers for luxury, sensuality, and profligacy. But Babylon represents the capital of every opulent kingdom, ancient and modern: the manners of all are the same; for power and riches never fail to produce luxury, sensuality, and profligacy. Canghi Emperor of China, who died in the year 1722, deserves to be recorded in the annals of fame, for resisting the softness and effeminacy of an Asiatic court. Far from abandoning himself to sensual pleasure, he passed several months yearly in the mountains of Tartary, mostly on horseback, and declining no fatigue. Nor in that situation were affairs of state neglected: many hours he borrowed from sleep, to hear his ministers, and to issue orders. How few monarchs, bred up like Canghi in the downy indolence of a seraglio, have resolution to withstand the temptations of sensual pleasure!

In

In no other history is the influence of prosperity and opulence on manners so conspicuous as in that of old Rome. During the second Punic war, when the Romans were reduced by Hannibal to fight *pro aris et focis*, Hiero King of Syracuse sent to Rome a large quantity of corn, with a golden statue of victory weighing three hundred and twenty pounds, which the senate accepted. But tho' their finances were at the lowest ebb, they accepted but the lightest of forty golden vases presented to them by the city of Naples, and politely returned, with many thanks, some golden vases sent by the city of Paestum, in Lucania. A rare instance of magnanimity. But no degree of virtue is proof against the corruption of conquest and opulence. Upon the influx of Asiatic riches and luxury, the Romans abandoned themselves to every vice: they became in particular wonderfully avaricious; breaking through every restraint of justice and humanity*. Spain in particular, which abounded with gold and silver, was for many years a scene, not only of oppression and cruelty, but of the basest treachery, practised against the natives by successive Roman generals, in order to accumulate wealth. Lucullus, who afterward made a capital figure in the Mithridatic war, attacked Clauca, a Celtiberian city, without the slightest provocation. Some of the principal citizens repaired to his camp with olive-branches, desiring to be informed upon what conditions they could purchase his friendship. It was agreed, that they should give hostages,

* Postquam divitiarum honor esse creperunt, et eas gloria, imperium, potentia sequeretur, hebescere virtus, paupertas probro haberi, innocentia pro malevolentia duci cepit. Igitur ex divitiis juventutem luxuria, atque avaritia, cum superbia invasere. Sallust. Bell. Cat. c. 12. — [In English thus: "After it had become an honour to be rich, and glory, empire, and power, became the attendants of riches, virtue declined apace, poverty was reckoned disgraceful, and innocence was held secret malice. Thus to the introduction of riches our youth owe that luxury, their avarice, and pride."]

with a hundred talents of silver. They also consented to admit a garrison of 2000 men, in order, as Lucullus pretended, to protect them against their enemies. But how were they protected? The gates were opened by the garrison to the whole army; and the inhabitants were butchered, without distinction of sex or age. What other remedy had they, but to invoke the gods presiding over oaths and covenants, and to pour out execrations against the Romans for their perfidy? Lucullus, enriched with the spoils of the town, felt no remorse for leaving 20,000 persons dead upon the spot. Shortly after, having laid siege to Intercatia, he solicited a treaty of peace. The citizens, reproaching him with the slaughter of the Caucans, asked, whether, in making peace, he was not to employ the same right hand, and the same faith, he had already pledged to their countrymen. Seroelius Galba, another Roman general, persuaded the Lusitanians to lay down their arms, promising them a fruitful territory instead of their own mountains; and having thus got them into his power, he ordered all of them to be murdered. Of the few that escaped Viriatus was one, who, in a long and bloody war against the Romans, amply avenged the massacre of his countrymen. Our author Appian reports, that Galba, surpassing even Lucullus in covetousness, distributed but a small share of the plunder among the soldiers, converting the bulk of it to his own use. He adds, that tho' Galba was one of the richest men in Rome, yet he never scrupled at lies nor perjury to procure money. But the corruption was general: Galba being accused of many misdemeanors, was acquitted by the senate through the force of bribes. A tribe of the Celtiberians, who had long served the Romans against the Lusitanians, had an offer made them by Titus Didius of a territory in their neighbourhood, lately conquered by him. He appointed them a day to receive possession; and having inclosed them in his camp under shew of friendship, he put them all to the sword; for which mighty deed he obtained

tained the honour of a triumph. The double-dealing and treachery of the Romans, in their last war against Carthage, is beyond example. The Carthaginians suspecting that a storm was gathering against them, sent deputies to Rome for securing peace, at any rate. The senate, in appearance, were disposed to amicable measures, demanding only hostages; and yet, tho' three hundred hostages were delivered without loss of time, the Roman army landed at Utica. The Carthaginian deputies attended the consuls there, desiring to know what more was to be done on their part. They were required to deliver up their arms; which they cheerfully did, imagining that they were now certain of peace. Instead of which, they received peremptory orders to evacuate the city, with their wives and children; and to take up no habitation within eighty furlongs of the sea. In perusing Appian's history of that memorable event, compassion for the distressed Carthaginians is stifled by indignation at their treacherous oppressors. Durst the monsters after such treachery talk of *Punica fides*? The profligacy of the Roman people, during the triumvirate of Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus, is painted in lively colours by the same author. "For a long time, disorder and confusion overspread the commonwealth: no office was obtained but by faction, bribery, or criminal service: no man was ashamed to buy votes, which were sold in open market. One man there was, who, to obtain a lucrative office, expended eight hundred talents (a); ill men enriched themselves with public money, or with bribes; no honest man would stand candidate for an office; and into a situation so miserable was the commonwealth reduced, that once for eight months it had not a single magistrate." Cicero, writing to Atticus that Clodius was acquitted by the influence of Crassus, expresses himself in the following words. "Biduo, per unum

(a) About L. 150,000 Sterling.

“servum, et eum ex gladiatorio ludo, confecit totum negotium.
 “Accersivit ad se, promisit, intercessit, dedit. Jam vero, O dii
 “boni, rem perditam! etiam noctes certarum mulierum, atque
 “adulescentulorum nobilium, introductiones nonnullis iudicibus
 “pro mercedis cumulo fuerunt * (a).” Ptolomy King of Egypt
 was dethroned by his subjects for tyranny. Having repaired to
 Rome for protection, he found means to poison the greater part of
 a hundred Egyptians, his accusers, and to assassinate Dion, their
 chief. And yet these crimes, perpetrated in the heart of Rome,
 were suffered to pass with impunity. But he had secured the lead-
 ing men by bribery, and was protected by Pompey. The follow-
 ing instance is, if possible, still more gross. Ptolomy, King of
 Cyprus, had always been a faithful ally to the Romans. But his
 gold, jewels, and precious moveables, were a tempting bait to the
 avarice of Rome; and all was confiscated by a decree of the
 people, without even a pretext. Money procured by profligacy is
 not commonly hoarded up; and the Romans were no less volup-
 tuous than avaricious. Alexander ab Alexandro mentions the Fa-
 nian, Orchian, Didian, Oppian, Cornelian, Ancian, and Julian
 laws, for repressing luxury of dress and of eating, all of which
 proved ineffectual. He adds, that Tiberius had it long at heart
 to contrive some effectual law against luxury, which now had sur-
 passed all bounds; but that he found it impracticable to stem the
 tide. He concludes, that by tacit agreement among a corrupted

* “In two days he completed the affair, by the means of one slave, a gladiator.
 “He sent for him, and by promises, wheedling, and large gifts, he gain’d his
 “point. Good God, to what an infamous height has corruption at length ar-
 “rived! Some judges were rewarded with a night’s lodging of certain ladies;
 “and others, for an illustrious bribe, had some young boys of Noble family in-
 “troduced to them.”

(a) Lib. 1. epist 13.

people all sumptuary laws were in effect abrogated; and that the Roman people, abandoning themselves to vice, broke through every restraint of morality and religion (a). Tremble, O Britain, on the brink of a precipice! how little distant in rapacity from Roman senators are the leaders of thy people!

Riches produce another lamentable effect: they enervate the possessor, and degrade him into a coward. He who commands the labour of others, who eats without hunger, and rests without fatigue, becomes feeble in mind, as well as in body, has no confidence in his own abilities, and is reduced to flatter his enemies, because he hath not courage to brave them.

Selfishness among the rude and illiterate is rough, blunt, and undisguised. Selfishness, which in an opulent kingdom usurps the place of patriotism, is smooth, refined, and covered with a veil. Pecuniary interest, a low object, must be covered with the thickest veil: ambition, less dishonourable, is less covered: but delicacy as to character and love of fame, are so honourable, that even the thinnest veil is reckoned unnecessary. History justifies these observations. During the prosperity of Greece and Rome, when patriotism was the ruling passion, no man ever thought of employing a hostile weapon but against the enemies of his country: swords were not worn during peace, nor do we ever read of a private duel. The frequency of duels in modern times is no slight symptom of degeneracy: regardless of our country, selfishness is exerted without disguise, when reputation or character is in question; and a nice sense of honour prompts revenge for every imagined affront, without regard to justice. How much more manly and patriotic was the behaviour of Themistocles, when insulted by the Lacedemonian general in deliberating about the concerns of Greece! "Strike," says he, "but first hear me."

(a) Lib. 3, cap. 11.

When

When a nation, formerly in a flourishing state, is depressed by luxury and selfishness, what follows next? Let the Egyptians answer the question. That unhappy people, having for many ages been a prey to every barbarous invader, are now become effeminate, treacherous, cruel, and corrupted with every vice that debases humanity. A nation in its infancy, however savage, is susceptible of every improvement; but a nation worn out with age and disease is susceptible of no improvement. There is no remedy, but to let the natives die out, and to repeople the country with better men.

I fly from a scene so dismal to one that will give no pain. Light is intended by our Maker for action, and darkness for rest. In the fourteenth century, the shops in Paris were opened at four in the morning: at present, a shopkeeper is scarce awake at seven. The King of France dined at eight in the morning, and retired to his bedchamber at the same hour in the evening; an early hour at present for public amusements. The Spaniards adhere to ancient customs *. Their King to this day dines precisely at noon, and sups no less precisely at nine in the evening. During the reign of Henry VIII. fashionable people in England breakfasted at seven in the morning, and dined at ten in the forenoon. In Elizabeth's time, the nobility, gentry, and students, dined at eleven forenoon, and supped between five and six afternoon. In the reign of Charles II. four in the afternoon was the appointed hour for acting plays. At present, even dinner is at a later hour. The King of Yeman, the greatest prince in Arabia Fœlix, dines at nine in the morning, sups at five after noon, and goes to rest at eleven. From this short specimen it appears, that the occupations of daylight commence gradually later and later; as if there were a tendency in polite nations of converting night into day, and day into night. Nothing happens without a cause. Light disposes to

* Manners and fashions seldom change where women are locked up.

action,

action, darkness to rest: The diversions of day are tournaments, tennis, hunting, racing, and such like active exercises: the diversions of night are sedentary: plays, cards, conversation. Balls are of a mixed nature, partly active in dancing, partly sedentary in conversing. Formerly, active exercises prevailed among a robust and plain people: the milder pleasures of society prevail as manners refine. Hence it is, that candle-light amusements are now fashionable in France, and in other polished countries; and when such amusements are much relished, they banish the robust exercises of the field. Balls, I conjecture, were formerly more frequent in day-light: at present, candle-light is their favourite time: the active part is at that time equally agreeable; and the sedentary part, much more so.

Gaming is the vice of idle people. Savages are addicted to gaming; and those of North America in particular, are fond to distraction of a game termed *the plutter*. A losing gamester will strip himself to the skin; and some have been known to stake their liberty, tho' by them valued above all other blessings. Negroes in the slave-coast of Guinea will stake their wives, their children, and even themselves. Tacitus (a), talking of gaming among the Germans, says, "Extremo ac novissimo jactu, de libertate et de corpore contendunt *." The Greeks were an active and sprightly people, constantly engaged in war, or in cultivating the fine arts. They had no leisure for gaming, nor any knowledge of it. Happy for them was their ignorance; for no other vice tends more to render men selfish, dishonest, and, in the modern style, dishonourable. A gamester, a friend to no man, is a bitter enemy to himself. The luxurious of the present age, pass every hour in gaming that can be spared from sensual pleasure. Idle-

* "For their last throw they stake their liberty and life."

(a) De moribus Germanorum, c. 24.

ness is their excuse, as it is among savages; and they would in some degree be excusable, were they never actuated by a more disgraceful motive.

Writers do not carefully distinguish, particular customs from general manners. Formerly, women were not admitted upon the stage in France, Italy, or England. At that very time, none but women were admitted in Spain. From that fashion it would be rash to infer, that women have more liberty in Spain than in the other countries mentioned; for the contrary is true. In Hindostan, established custom prompts women to burn themselves alive with the bodies of their deceased husbands; but from that singular custom, it would be a false inference, that the Hindoo women are either more bold, or more affectionate to their husbands, than in other countries. The Polanders, even after they became Christians in the thirteenth century, adhered to the customs of their forefathers, the Sarmatians; the killing, for example, infants born deformed, and men debilitated by age; which would betoken horrid barbarity, if it were not a singular custom. Roman Catholics imagine, that there is no religion in England nor in Holland, because, from a spirit of civil liberty, all sects are there tolerated. The encouragement given to assassination in Italy, where every church is a sanctuary, makes strangers rashly infer, that the Italians are all assassins. Writers sometimes fall into an opposite mistake, attributing to a particular nation, certain manners and customs common to all nations in one or other period of their progress. It is remarked by Heraclides Ponticus, as peculiar to the Athamanes, that the men fed the flocks, and the women cultivated the ground. This has been the practice of all nations, in their progress from the shepherd-state to that of husbandry; and is at present the practice among American savages. The same author observes as peculiar to the Celts and Aphetai, that they leave their doors open without hazard of theft.

But

But that practice is common among all savages in the first stage of society, before the use of money is known.

Hitherto there appears as great uniformity in the progress of manners, as can reasonably be expected among so many different nations. There is one exception, extraordinary indeed if true, which is, the manners of the Caledonians described by Ossian, manners so pure and refined as scarce to be equalled in the most cultivated nations. Such manners among a people in the first stage of society, acquainted with no arts but hunting and making war, would, I acknowledge, be miraculous; and yet to suppose all to be invented by an illiterate savage, seems little less miraculous. One, at first view, will, without hesitation, declare the whole a pure fiction; for how is it credible, that a people, rude at present and illiterate, were, in the infancy of their society, highly refined in sentiments and manners? And yet upon a more accurate inspection, many weighty considerations occur to balance that opinion.

From a thousand circumstances it appears, that the works of Ossian are not a late production. They are composed in an old dialect of the Celtic tongue; and as, till of late, they were known only in the highlands of Scotland, the author must have been a Caledonian. The translator (a) saw in the Isle of Sky the first four books of the poem Fingal, written in a fair hand on vellum, and bearing date in the year 1403. The natives believe that poem to be very ancient: every person has passages of it by heart, transmitted by memory from their forefathers. Their dogs bear commonly the name of *Luath*, *Bran*, &c. mentioned in these poems, as our dogs do of *Pompey* and *Cesar* *. Many other particulars might

(a) Mr. Macpherson.

* In the Isle of Sky, the ruins of the castle of Dunseach upon an inaccessible

might be mentioned; but these are sufficient to evince, that the work must have existed at least, three or four centuries. And taking that for granted, I proceed to certain considerations tending to evince, that the manners described in Ossian were Caledonian manners, and not a pure fiction. And after perusing with attention these considerations, I am not afraid that even the most incredulous will continue altogether unshaken.

It is a noted and well-founded observation, That manners are never painted to the life by any one to whom they are not familiar. It is not difficult to draw the outlines of imaginary manners; but to fill up the picture with all the variety of tints that manners assume in different situations, uniting all in one entire whole, — *hic labor, hoc opus est*. Yet the manners here supposed to be invented, are delineated in a variety of incidents, of sentiments, of images, and of allusions, making one entire picture, without once deviating into the slightest incongruity. Every scene in Ossian relates to hunting, to fighting, and to love, the sole occupations of men in the original state of society: there is not a single image, simile, nor allusion, but what is borrowed from that state, without a jarring circumstance. Supposing all to be mere invention, is it not amazing to find no mention of highland clans, nor of any name now in use? Is it not still more amazing, that there is not the slightest hint of the Christian religion, not even in a metaphor or allusion? Is it not equally amazing, that in a work where deer's flesh is frequently mentioned, and a curious method of roasting it, there should not be a word of fish as food, which is so common in later times? Very few

rock hanging over the sea, are still visible. That castle, as vouched by tradition, belonged to Cuchullin Lord of that Isle, whose history is recorded in the Poem of Fingal. Upon the green before the castle there is a great stone, to which, according to the same tradition, his dog Luath was chained.

highlanders

will cheerfully be acknowledged by every reader of taste: he certainly was a great master in his way. Now, whether the work be late, or composed four centuries ago, a man of such talents inventing a historical fable, and laying the scene of action among savages in the hunter-state, would naturally frame a system of manners the best suited in his opinion to that state. What then could tempt him to adopt a system of manners so opposite to any notion he could frame of savage manners? The absurdity is so gross, that we are forced, however reluctantly, to believe, that these manners are not fictitious, but in reality the manners of his country, coloured perhaps, or a little heightened, according to the privilege of an epic poet. And once admitting that fact, there can be no hesitation in ascribing the work to Ossian, son of Fin-gal, whose name it bears: we have no better evidence for the authors of several Greek and Roman books. Upon the same evidence we must believe, that Ossian lived in the reign of the Emperor Caracalla, of whom frequent mention is made under the designation of *Caracul the Great King*; at which period the shepherd-state was scarce known in Caledonia, and husbandry not at all. Had he lived so late as the twelfth century, when there were flocks and herds in that country, and some sort of agriculture, a poet of genius, such as Ossian undoubtedly was, would have drawn from these his finest images.

The foregoing considerations, I am persuaded, would not fail to convert the most incredulous, were it not for a consequence extremely improbable, that a people, little better at present than savages, were in their primitive hunter-state highly refined; for such Ossian describes them. And yet it is not less improbable that such manners should be invented by an illiterate highland bard. Let a man chuse either side, the difficulty cannot be solved but by a miracle. What shall we conclude upon the whole? for the mind cannot for ever remain in suspense. As dry reasoning
has

has left us in a dilemma, taste perhaps and feeling may extricate us. May not the case be here as in real painting? A portrait drawn from fancy may resemble the human visage, but such peculiarity of countenance and expression as serves to distinguish a certain person from every other, is always wanting. Present a portrait to a man of taste, and he will be at no loss to say, whether it be copied from the life, or be the product of fancy. If Ossian paint from fancy, the cloven foot will appear: but if his portraits be complete, so as to express every peculiarity of character, why should we doubt of their being copied from life? In that view, the reader, I am hopeful, will not think his time thrown away in examining some of Ossian's striking pictures. We see not another resource.

Love of fame is painted by Ossian as the ruling passion of his countrymen the Caledonians. Warriors are every where described, as esteeming it their chief happiness to be recorded in the songs of the bards: that feature is never wanting in any of Ossian's heroes. Take the following instances. "King of the roaring
 "Strumon, said the rising joy of Fingal, do I behold thee in
 "arms after thy strength has failed? Often hath Morni shone
 "in battles, like the beam of the rising sun, when he disperses
 "the storms of the hill, and brings peace to the glittering fields.
 "But why didst thou not rest in thine age? Thy renown is in
 "the song! the people behold thee, and bless the departure of
 "mighty Morni (a). Son of Fingal, he said, why burns the soul
 "of Gaul? My heart beats high: my steps are disordered, and
 "my hand trembles on my sword. When I look toward the foe,
 "my soul lightens before me, and I see their sleeping host.
 "Tremble thus the souls of the valiant in battles of the spear?
 "How would the soul of Morni rise if we should rush on the foe?
 "What shall we conclude upon the whole? for
 "(a) Lathmon. the mind cannot for ever remain in suspense.
 "Our

"Our renown would grow in the song, and our steps be stately
 "in the eye of the brave * (a)."

That a warrior has acquired his fame is a consolation in every
 distress: "Carril, said the King in secret, the strength of Cu-
 "chullin fails. My days are with the years that are past; and
 "no morning of mine shall arise. They shall seek me at Temora,
 "but I shall not be found. Cormac will weep in his hall, and
 "say, Where is Tura's chief? But my name is renowned, my
 "fame in the song of bards. The youth will say in secret, *O let*
 "*me die as Cuchullin died: renown clothed him like a robe; and the*
 "*light of his fame is great.* Draw the arrow from my side; and
 "lay Cuchullin below that oak. Place the shield of Caithbat near,
 "that they may behold me amid the arms of my fathers (b)."
 Fingal speaks: "Ullin, my aged bard, take the ship of the King.
 "Carry Oscar to Selma, and let the daughters of Morven weep.
 "We shall fight in Erin for the race of fallen Cormac. The days
 "of my years begin to fail: I feel the weakness of my arm. My
 "fathers bend from their clouds to receive their gray-hair'd son.
 "But, Trenmor! before I go hence, one beam of my fame shall
 "rise: in fame shall my days end, as my years begun: my life
 "shall be one stream of light to other times (c)." Ossian speaks:

* Love of fame is a laudable passion, which every man values himself upon. Fame in war is acquired by courage and candour, which are esteemed by all: it is not acquired by fighting for spoil, because avarice is despised by all. The spoils of an enemy were display'd at a Roman triumph, not for their own sake, but as a mark of victory. When nations at war degenerate from love of fame to love of gain, stratagem, deceit, breach of faith, and every sort of immorality, are never-failing consequences.

(a) Lathmon.

(b) The death of Cuchullin.

(c) Temora.

" Did

" Did thy beauty last, O Ryno! stood the strength of car-borne
 " Oscar *! Fingal himself passed away, and the halls of his fa-
 " thers forgot his steps. And shalt thou remain, aged bard, when
 " the mighty have failed? But my fame shall remain; and grow
 " like the oak of Morven, which lifts its broad head to the storm,
 " and rejoiceth in the course of the wind (a)."
 The chief cause of affliction when a young man is cut off in
 battle, is his not having received his fame: " And fell the swiftest
 " in the race, said the King, the first to bend the bow? Thou
 " scarce hast been known to me; why did young Ryno fall? But
 " sleep thou softly on Lena, Fingal shall soon behold thee. Soon
 " shall my voice be heard no more, and my footsteps cease to be
 " seen. The bards will tell of Fingal's name: the stones will talk
 " of me. But, Ryno! thou art low indeed, thou hast not re-
 " ceived thy fame. Ullin, strike the harp for Ryno; tell what
 " the chief would have been. Farewell thou first in every field.
 " No more shall I direct thy dart. Thou that hast been so fair;
 " I behold thee not.—Farewell (b)." " Calthion rushed into the
 " stream: I bounded forward on my spear: Teutha's race fell
 " before us: night came rolling down. Dunthalmo rested on a
 " rock, amidst an aged wood: the rage of his bosom burned a-
 " gainst the car-borne Calthion. But Calthion stood in his grief;
 " he mourned the fallen Colmar; Colmar slain in youth, before
 " his fame arose (c)."

* Several of Ossian's heroes are described as fighting in cars. The Britons in
 general fought in that manner. *Britanni dimicant non equitatu modo, aut pedite,*
verum et bigis et curribus. Pomponius Mela, l. 3.—[In English thus: "The Bri-
tons fight, not only with cavalry, or foot, but also with cars and chariots."]

(a) Berrathon.

(b) Fingal.

(c) Calthion and Colmar.

Lamentation

Lamentation for loss of fame. Cuchullin speaks: "But, O ye
 "ghosts of the lonely Cromla! ye souls of chiefs that are no
 "more! be ye the companions of Cuchullin, and talk to him in
 "the cave of his sorrow. For never more shall I be renowned
 "among the mighty in the land. I am like a beam that has
 "shone; like a mist that fled away when the blast of the morning
 "came, and brightened the shaggy side of the hill. Connal, talk
 "of arms no more: departed is my fame. My sighs shall be on
 "Cromla's wind, till my footsteps cease to be seen. And thou
 "white-bosom'd Bragéla, mourn over the fall of my fame; for,
 "vanquished, never will I return to thee, thou sun-beam of
 "Dunfcaich (a)."

Love of fame begets heroic actions, which go hand in hand with
 elevated sentiments: of the former there are examples in every
 page; of the latter take the following examples. "And let
 "him come, replied the King. I love a foe like Cathmor: his
 "soul is great; his arm strong; and his battles full of fame.
 "But the little soul is like a vapour that hovers round the marshy
 "lake, which never rises on the green hill, lest the winds meet it
 "there (b)." Ossian speaks: "But let us fly, son of Morni,
 "Lathmon descends the hill. Then let our steps be slow, replied
 "the fair-hair'd Gaul, lest the foe say with a smile, Behold the
 "warriors of night: they are like ghosts, terrible in darkness;
 "but they melt away before the beam of the East (c)." "Son of
 "the feeble hand, said Lathmon, shall my host descend! They
 "are but two, and shall a thousand lift their steel! Nuab would
 "mourn in his hall for the departure of Lathmon's fame: his
 "eyes would turn from Lathmon, when the tread of his feet ap-

(a) Fingal.

(b) Lathmon.

(c) Lathmon.

proached. Go thou to the heroes, son of Dutha, for I behold
 the stately steps of Ossian. His fame is worthy of my steel:
 let him fight with Lathmon (a). Fingal does not delight in
 battle, tho' his arm is strong. My renown grows on the fall of
 the haughty: the lightning of my steel pours on the proud in
 arms. The battle comes; and the tombs of the valiant rise;
 the tombs of my people rise, O my fathers, and I at last must
 remain alone. But I will remain renowned, and the departure
 of my soul shall be one stream of light (b). I raised my voice
 for Fovar-gormo, when they laid the chief in earth. The aged
 Crothar was there, but his sigh was not heard. He searched
 for the wound of his son, and found it in his breast: joy rose
 in the face of the aged: he came and spoke to Ossian: King of
 spears, my son hath not fallen without his fame: the young
 warrior did not fly, but met death as he went forward in his
 strength. Happy are they who die in youth, when their re-
 nown is heard: their memory shall be honoured in the song;
 the young tear of the virgin falls (c). Cuchullin kindled at
 the sight, and darkness gathered on his brow. His hand was
 on the sword of his fathers: his red-rolling eye on the foe. He
 thrice attempted to rush to battle, and thrice did Connal stop
 him. Chief of the isle of mist, he said, Fingal subdues the
 foe: seek not a part of the fame of the King (d).
 The pictures that Ossian draws of his countrymen are no less
 remarkable for tender sentiments, than for elevation. Parental af-
 fection is finely touched in the following passage. "Son of Com-

(a) Lathmon.

(b) Lathmon.

(c) Croma.

(d) Fingal.

"hal, replied the chief, the strength of Morni's arm has failed.
 "I attempt to draw the sword of my youth, but it remains in its
 "place: I throw the spear, but it falls short of the mark; and I
 "feel the weight of my shield. We decay like the grass of the
 "mountain, and our strength returns no more. I have a son, O
 "Fingal! his soul has delighted in the actions of Morni's youth;
 "but his sword has not been lifted against the foe, neither has
 "his fame begun. I come with him to battle, to direct his arm.
 "His renown will be a sun to my soul, in the dark hour of my
 "departure. O that the name of Morni were forgot among the
 "people, that the heroes would only say, Behold the father of
 "Gaul (a)!" And no less finely touched is grief for the loss of
 "children: "We saw Oscar leaning on his shield: we saw his
 "blood around. Silence darkened on the face of every hero:
 "each turned his back and wept. The King strove to hide his
 "tears. He bends his head over his son; and his words are
 "mixed with sighs. And art thou fallen, Oscar, in the midst of
 "thy course! The heart of the aged beats over thee. I see thy
 "coming battles: I behold the battles that ought to come, but
 "they are cut off from thy fame. When shall joy dwell at Sel-
 "ma? when shall the song of grief cease on Morven? My sons
 "fall by degrees, Fingal will be the last of his race. The fame I
 "have received shall pass away: my age shall be without friends.
 "I shall sit like a grey cloud in my hall: nor shall I expect the re-
 "turn of a son with his sounding arms. Weep, ye heroes of Mor-
 "ven; never more will Oscar rise (b)." Crothar speaks. "Son
 "of Fingal! dost thou not behold the darkness of Crothar's hall
 "of shells? My soul was not dark at the feast, when my people
 "lived. I rejoiced in the presence of strangers, when my son

(a) Lathmon.

(b) Temora.

" shone

"thone in the hall. But, Offian, he is a beam that is departed, and
 "left no streak of light behind. He is fallen, son of Fingal, in the
 "battles of his father. — Rothmar, the chief of grassy Tromlo,
 "heard that my eyes had failed; he heard, that my arms were
 "fixed in the hall, and the pride of his soul arose. He came to-
 "ward Croma; my people fell before him. I took my arms in
 "the hall; but what could fightless Crothar do? My steps were
 "unequal; my grief was great. I wished for the days that were
 "past, days wherein I fought and won in the field of blood. My
 "son returned from the chase, the fair-hair'd Fovar-gormo. He
 "had not lifted his sword in battle, for his arm was young. But
 "the soul of the youth was great; the fire of valour burnt in his
 "eyes. He saw the disordered steps of his father, and his sigh
 "arose. King of Croma, he said, is it because thou hast no son;
 "is it for the weakness of Fovar-gormo's arm that thy sighs a-
 "rise? I begin, my father, to feel the strength of my arm; I
 "have drawn the sword of my youth; and I have bent the bow.
 "Let me meet this Rothmar with the youths of Croma; let me
 "meet him, O my father; for I feel my burning soul. And
 "thou shalt meet him, I said, son of the fightless Crothar! But
 "let others advance before thee, that I may hear the tread of thy
 "feet at thy return; for my eyes behold thee not, fair-hair'd
 "Fovar-gormo! — He went, he met the foe; he fell. The foe
 "advances toward Croma. He who slew my son is near, with all
 "his pointed spears (a)."

The following sentiments about the shortness of human life are
 pathetic. "Desolate is the dwelling of Moina, silence in the house
 "of her fathers. Raise the song of mourning over the strangers.
 "One day we must fall; and they have only fallen before us. —
 "Why dost thou build the hall, son of the winged days! Thou

(a) Croma.

"lookest from thy towers to day : soon will the blast of the desert
 "come. It howls in thy empty court, and whistles over thy half-
 "worn shield (a)." "How long shall we weep on Lena, or pour
 "our tears in Ullin ! The mighty will not return ; nor Oscar rise
 "in his strength : the valiant must fall one day, and be no more
 "known. Where are our fathers, O warriors, the chiefs of the
 "times of old ! They are set, like stars that have shone : we only
 "hear the sound of their praise. But they were renowned in
 "their day, and the terror of other times. Thus shall we pass,
 "O warriors, in the day of our fall. Then let us be renowned
 "while we may ; and leave our fame behind us, like the last
 "beams of the sun, when he hides his red head in the west (b)."

In Homer's time, heroes were greedy of plunder ; and, like
 robbers, were much disposed to insult a vanquished foe. Accord-
 ing to Ossian, the ancient Caledonians had no idea of plunder :
 and as they fought for fame only, their humanity overflow'd to
 the vanquished. American savages, it is true, are not addicted to
 plunder, and are ready to bestow on the first comer what trifles
 they force from the enemy. But they have no notion of a pitched
 battle, nor of single combat : on the contrary, they value them-
 selves upon slaughtering their enemies by surprise, without risk-
 ing their own sweet persons. Agreeable to the magnanimous cha-
 racter given by Ossian of his countrymen, we find humanity
 blended with courage in all their actions. "Fingal pitied the
 "white-armed maid : he stayed the uplifted sword. The tear
 "was in the eye of the King, as bending forward he spoke :
 "King of streamy Sora, fear not the sword of Fingal : it was ne-
 "ver stained with the blood of the vanquished ; it never pierced
 "a fallen foe. Let thy people rejoice along the blue waters of

(a) Carthon.

(b) Temora.

"Tora! let the maids of thy love be glad. Why should'st thou
 "fall in thy youth, King of streamy Sora (a)!" Fingal speaks:
 "Son of my strength, he said, take the spear of Fingal, go to
 "Teutha's mighty stream, and save the car-borne Colmar. Let
 "thy fame return before thee like a pleasant gale; that my soul
 "may rejoice over my son, who renews the renown of our fa-
 "thers. Ossian! be thou a storm in battle, but mild where the
 "foes are low. It was thus my fame arose, O my son; and be
 "thou like Selma's chief. When the haughty come to my hall,
 "my eyes behold them not; but my arm is stretched forth to
 "the unhappy, my sword defends the weak (b)." "O Oscar!
 "bend the strong in arm, but spare the feeble hand. Be thou a
 "stream of many tides against the foes of thy people, but like the
 "gale that moves the grass to those who ask thy aid. Never
 "search for the battle, nor shun it when it comes. So Trenmor
 "lived; such Trathal was; and such has Fingal been. My arm
 "was the support of the injured; and the weak rested behind the
 "lightning of my steel (c)."

Humanity to the vanquished is display'd in the following pas-
 sages. After defeating in battle Swaran King of Lochlin, Fingal
 says, "Raise, Ullin, raise the song of peace, and soothe my soul
 "after battle, that my ear may forget the noise of arms. And
 "let a hundred harps be near to gladden the King of Lochlin:
 "he must depart from us with joy: none ever went sad from
 "Fingal. Oscar, the lightning of my sword is against the strong;
 "but peaceful it hangs by my side when warriors yield in
 "battle (d)" "Uthal fell beneath my sword, and the sons of

(a) Carrie-thura.

(b) Calthon and Colmal.

(c) Fingal, book 3.

(d) Fingal, book 6.

(a) Carthor.

(b) Temora.

"Berrathon

" Berrathon fled. It was then I saw him in his beauty, and the
 " tear hung in my eye. Thou art fallen, young tree, I said, with
 " all thy budding beauties round thee. The winds come from
 " the desert, and there is no sound in thy leaves. Lovely art
 " thou in death, son of car-borne Lathmor (a)."

After the scenes above exhibited, it will not be thought that Of-
 fian deviates from the manners represented by him, in describing
 the hospitality of his chieftains: " We heard the voice of joy on
 " the coast, and we thought that the mighty Cathmor came ;
 " Cathmor, the friend of strangers, the brother of red-hair'd Cair-
 " bar. But their souls were not the same ; for the light of
 " heaven was in the bosom of Cathmor. His towers rose on
 " the banks of Atha : seven paths led to his hall : seven chiefs
 " stood on these paths, and called the stranger to the feast. But
 " Cathmor dwelt in the wood, to avoid the voice of praise (b)."
 " Rathmor was a chief of Clutha. The feeble dwelt in his hall.
 " The gates of Rathmor were never closed : his feast was always
 " spread. The sons of the stranger came, and blessed the gene-
 " rous chief of Clutha. Bards raised the song, and touched the
 " harp : joy brightened on the face of the mournful. Dunthal-
 " mo came in his pride, and rushed into combat with Rathmor.
 " The chief of Clutha overcame. The rage of Dunthalmo rose :
 " he came by night with his warriors ; and the mighty Rathmor
 " fell : he fell in his hall, where his feast had been often spread
 " for strangers (c)." It seems not to exceed the magnanimity of
 his chieftains, intent upon glory only, to feast even their enemies
 before a battle. Cuchullin, after the first day's engagement with
 Swaran, King of Lochlin or Scandinavia, says to Carril, one of

(a) Berrathon.

(b) Temora.

(c) Calthor and Colmal.

his bards, "Is this feast spread for me alone, and the King of Lochlin on Ullin's shore; far from the deer of his hills, and founding halls of his feasts? Rise, Carril of other times, and carry my words to Swaran; tell him from the roaring of waters, that Cuchullin gives his feast. Here let him listen to the found of my groves amid the clouds of night: for cold and bleak the blustering winds rush over the foam of his seas. Here let him praise the trembling harp, and hear the songs of heroes (a)." The Scandinavian King, less polished, refused the invitation. Cairbar speaks: "Spread the feast on Lena, and let my hundred bards attend. And thou, red-hair'd Olla, take the harp of the King. Go to Oscar, King of swords, and bid him to our feast. To-day we feast and hear the song; to-morrow break the spears (b)." Olla came with his songs. Oscar went to Cairbar's feast. Three hundred heroes attend the chief, and the clang of their arms is terrible. The gray dogs bound on the heath, and their howling is frequent. Fingal saw the departure of the hero: the soul of the King was sad. He dreads the gloomy Cairbar: but who of the race of Trenmor fears the foe (c)?

Cruelty is every where condemned as an infamous vice. Speaking of the bards, "Cairbar feared to stretch his sword to the bards, tho' his soul was dark; but he closed us in the midst of darkness. Three days we pined alone: on the fourth the noble Cathmor came. He heard our voice from the cave, and turned the eye of his wrath on Cairbar. Chief of Atha, he said, how long wilt thou pain my soul? Thy heart is like the rock of the desert, and thy thoughts are dark. But thou art the brother

(a) Fingal, book 1.

(b) Temora.

(c) Temora.

"of Cathmor, and he will fight thy battles. Cathmor's soul is
 "not like thine, thou feeble hand of war. The light of my bo-
 "som is stained with thy deeds. The bards will not sing of my
 "renown: they may say, Cathmor was brave, but he fought for
 "gloomy Cairbar: they will pass over my tomb in silence, and
 "my fame shall not be heard. Cairbar, loose the bards; they are
 "the sons of other times: their voice shall be heard in other ages
 "when the Kings of Temora have failed (a)." "Ullin rais'd his
 "white sails: the wind of the south came forth. He bounded on
 "the waves toward Selma's walls. The feast is spread on Lena:
 "an hundred heroes reared the tomb of Cairbar; but no song is
 "raised over the chief, for his soul had been dark and bloody. We
 "remembered the fall of Cormac; and what could we say in Cair-
 "bar's praise (b)."

Genuine manners never were represented more to the life by a Tacitus nor a Shakespear. Such painting is above the reach of pure invention, and must be the work of knowledge and feeling.

One may discover the manners of a nation from the figure their women make. Among savages, women are treated like slaves; and they acquire not the dignity that belongs to the sex, till manners be considerably refined. According to the manners above described, women ought to have made a considerable figure among the ancient Caledonians. Let us examine Ossian upon that subject, in order to judge whether he carries on the same tone of manners to every particular. That women were highly regarded, appears from the following passages. "Daughter of the hand of
 "snow! I was not so mournful and blind, I was not so dark and
 "forlorn, when Everallin loved me, Everallin with the dark-
 "brown hair, the white-bosomed love of Cormac. A thousand

(a) Temora.

(b) Temora.

" heroes fought the maid, she denied her love to a thousand; the
 " sons of the sword were despised; for graceful in her eyes was
 " Ossian. I went in suit of the maid to Lego's sable forge; twelve
 " of my people were there, sons of the streamy Morven. We
 " came to Branno friend of strangers, Branno of the founding
 " mail. — From whence, he said, are the arms of steel? Not ea-
 " sy to win is the maid that has denied the blue-eyed sons of Erin.
 " But blest be thou, O son of Fingal, happy is the maid that
 " waits thee. Tho' twelve daughters of beauty were mine, thine
 " were the choice, thou son of fame! Then he opened the hall
 " of the maid, the dark-hair'd Everallin. Joy kindled in our
 " breasts of steel, and blest the maid of Branno (a)." " Now
 " Connal, on Cromla's windy side, spoke to the chief of the noble
 " car. Why that gloom, son of Semo? Our friends are the
 " mighty in battle. And renowned art thou, O warrior! many
 " were the deaths of thy steel. Often has Bragela met thee with
 " blue-rolling eyes of joy; often has she met her hero returning
 " in the midst of the valiant, when his sword was red with slaugh-
 " ter, and his foes silent in the field of the tomb. Pleasant to her
 " ears were thy bards, when thine actions rose in the song (b)."
 " But, King of Morven, if I shall fall, as one time the warrior
 " must fall, raise my tomb in the midst, and let it be the great-
 " est on Lena. And send over the dark-blue wave the sword of
 " Orla, to the spouse of his love; that she may show it to her son,
 " with tears, to kindle his soul to war (c)." " I lifted my eyes
 " to Cromla, and I saw the son of generous Semo. — Sad and slow
 " he retired from his hill toward the lonely cave of Tura. He

(a) Fingal, book 4.

(b) Fingal, book 5.

(c) Fingal, book 5.

"saw Fingal victorious, and mixed his joy with grief. The sun
 "is bright on his armour, and Connal slowly followed. They
 "sunk behind the hill, like two pillars of the fire of night, when
 "winds pursue them over the mountain, and the flaming heath
 "resounds. Beside a stream of roaring foam, his cave is in a
 "rock. One tree bends above it; and the rushing winds echo a-
 "gainst its sides. There rests the chief of Dunscach, the son of
 "generous Semo. His thoughts are on the battles he lost; and
 "the tear is on his cheek. He mourned the departure of his
 "fame, that fled like the mist of Cona. O Bragela, thou art too
 "far remote to cheer the soul of the hero. But let him see thy
 "bright form in his soul; that his thoughts may return to the
 "lonely sun-beam of Dunscach (a)." "Ossian King of swords,
 "replied the bard, thou best raisest the song. Long hast thou
 "been known to Carril, thou ruler of battles. Often have I
 "touched the harp to lovely Everallin. Thou, too, hast often
 "accompanied my voice in Branno's hall of shells. And often
 "amidst our voices was heard the mildest Everallin. One day
 "the sung of Cormac's fall, the youth that died for her love. I
 "saw the tears on her cheek, and on thine, thou chief of men.
 "Her soul was touched for the unhappy, tho' she loved him not.
 "How fair among a thousand maids, was the daughter of the
 "generous Branno (b)." "It was in the days of peace, replied
 "the great Clessammor, I came in my bounding ship to Balclu-
 "tha's walls of towers. The winds had roared behind my sails,
 "and Clutha's streams received my dark-bosomed vessel. Three
 "days I remained in Reuthamir's halls, and saw that beam of
 "light, his daughter. The joy of the shell went round, and the
 "aged hero gave the fair. Her breasts were like foam on the

(a) Fingal, book 5.

(b) Fingal, book 5.

" wave,

"wave, and her eyes like stars of light: her hair was dark as the
 "raven's wing: her soul was generous and mild. My love for
 "Moina was great: and my heart poured forth in joy (a)." "The
 "fame of Offian shall rise: his deeds shall be like his father's.
 "Let us rush in our arms, son of Morni, let us rush to battle.
 "Gaul, if thou shalt return, go to Selma's lofty hall. Tell Ever-
 "allin that I fell with fame: carry the sword to Branno's daugh-
 "ter: let her give it to Oscar when the years of his youth shall
 "arise (b)." "The rear is on his cheek. He mourned the death."

Next to war, love makes the principal figure: and well it may;
 for in Offian's poems it breathes every thing sweet, tender, and e-
 levated. "On Lubar's grassy banks they fought; and Grudar
 "fell. Fierce Cairbar came to the vale of the echoing Tura,
 "where Brassolis, fairest of his sisters, all alone raised the song
 "of grief. She sung the actions of Grudar, the youth of her se-
 "cret soul: she mourned him in the field of blood; but still she
 "hoped his return. Her white bosom is seen from her robe, as
 "the moon from the clouds of night: her voice was softer than
 "the harp, to raise the song of grief: her soul was fixed on Grudar,
 "the secret look of her eye was his; — when wilt thou come in
 "thine arms, thou mighty in the war? Take, Brassolis, Cair-
 "bar said, take this shield of blood: fix it on high within my
 "hall, the armour of my foe. Her soft heart beat against
 "her side: distracted, pale, she flew, and found her youth in his
 "blood. — She died on Cromla's heath. Here rests their dust,
 "Cuchullin; and these two lonely yews, sprung from their
 "tombs, wish to meet on high. Fair was Brassolis on the plain,
 "and Grudar on the hill. The bard shall preserve their names,
 "aged hero gave the hint. Her breast was like foam on the

(a) Carthon.

(b) Lathmon.

"and repeat them to future times (a)." "Pleasant is thy voice,
 "O Carril, said the blue-eyed chief of Erin; and lovely are the
 "words of other times: they are like the calm shower of spring,
 "when the sun looks on the field, and the light cloud flies over
 "the hill. O strike the harp in praise of my love, the lonely sun-
 "beam of Dunscaich: strike the harp in praise of Bragela, whom
 "I left in the isle of mist, the spouse of Semo's son.—Dost thou
 "raise thy fair face from the rock to find the sails of Cuchullin?
 "the sea is rolling far distant, and its white foam will deceive
 "thee for my sails. Retire, my love, for it is night, and the
 "dark winds sigh in thy hair: retire to the hall of my feasts, and
 "think of times that are past; for I will not return till the storm
 "of war cease.—O Connal, speak of war and arms, and send
 "her from my mind; for lovely with her raven-hair is the white-
 "bosomed daughter of Sorglan (b)." Malvina speaks. "But
 "thou dwellest in the soul of Malvina, son of mighty Ossian.
 "My sighs arise with the beam of the east, my tears descend with
 "the drops of night. I was a lovely tree in thy presence, Oscar,
 "with all my branches round me; but thy death came like a
 "blast from the desert, and laid my green head low: the spring
 "returned with its showers, but of me not a leaf sprung. The
 "virgins saw me silent in the hall, and they touched the harp of
 "joy. The tear was on the cheek of Malvina, and the virgins
 "beheld my grief. Why art thou sad, they said, thou first of
 "the maids of Lutha? Was he lovely as the beam of the morn-
 "ing, and stately in thy sight (c)?" "Fingal came in his mild-
 "ness, rejoicing in secret over the actions of his son. Morni's
 "face brightened with gladness, and his aged eyes looked faint-

(a) Fingal, book. 1.

(b) Fingal, book. 1.

(c) Cromia.

“ly through tears of joy. We came to the halls of Selma, and
 “far round the feast of shells. The maids of the song came into
 “our presence, and the mildly-blushing Everallin. Her dark
 “hair spreads on her neck of snow, her eye rolls in secret on Of-
 “sian. She touches the harp of music, and we bless the daugh-
 “ter of Branno (a).”

Had the Caledonians made slaves of their women, and thought as meanly of them as savages commonly do, it could never have entered the imagination of Ossian, to ascribe to them those numberless graces that exalt the female sex, and render many of them objects of pure and elevated affection. Without the aid of inspiration, such refined manners could never have been conceived by a savage. I say more: Supposing a savage to have been divinely inspired, manners so inconsistent with their own, would not have been relished, nor even comprehended, by his countrymen. And yet that they were highly relished is certain, having been universally diffused among all ranks, and preserved for many ages by memory alone, without writing. Here the argument mentioned above strikes with double force, to evince, that the manners of the Caledonians must have been really such as Ossian describes.

Catharina Alexowna, Empress of Russia, promoted assemblies of men and women, as a means to polish the manners of her subjects. And in order to preserve decency in such assemblies, she published a body of regulations, of which the following are a specimen. “Ladies who play at forfeitures, questions and com-
 “mands, &c. shall not be noisy nor riotous. No gentleman must
 “attempt to force a kiss, nor strike a woman in the assembly,
 “under pain of exclusion. Ladies are not to get drunk upon any
 “pretext whatever; nor gentlemen before nine.” Compare the

(a) Lathmon.

manners that required such regulations with those described above. Can we suppose, that the ladies and gentlemen of Ossian's poems ever amused themselves, after the age of twelve, with hide and seek, questions and commands, or such childish play? Can it enter into our thoughts, that Bragéla or Malvina were so often drunk, as to require the reprimand of a public regulation? or that any hero of Ossian ever struck a woman of fashion in ire?

The immortality of the soul was a capital article in the Celtic creed, inculcated by the Druids (*a*). And in Valerius Maximus we find the following passage. "Gallos, memoriae proditum est, pecunias mutuas, quæ sibi apud inferos redderentur, dare: quia persuasum habuerint, animas hominum immortales esse. Dicerem stultos, nisi idem braccati sensissent quod palliatus Pythagoras sensit * (*b*). All savages have an impression of immortality; but few, even of the most enlightened before Christianity prevailed, had the least notion of any occupations in another life, but what they were accustomed to in this. Even Virgil, with all his poetical invention, finds no amusements for his departed heroes, but what they were fond of when alive; the same love for war, the same taste for hunting, and the same affection to their friends. As we have no reason to expect more invention in Ossian, the observation may serve as a key to the ghosts introduced by him, and to his whole machinery, as termed by critics. His description of these ghosts is copied plainly from the creed of his country.

* "It is reported, that the Gauls frequently lent money to be paid back in the infernal regions, from a firm persuasion that the souls of men were immortal. I would have called them fools, if those wearers of breeches had not thought the same as Pythagoras who wore a cloak."

(*a*) Pomponius Mela. Ammianus Marcellinus.

(*b*) Lib. 2.

In a historical account of the progress of manners, it would argue gross insensibility to overlook those above mentioned. The subject, it is true, has swelled upon my hands beyond expectation; but it is not a little interesting. If these manners be genuine, they are a singular phenomenon in the History of Man: if they be the invention of an illiterate bard, among savages utterly ignorant of such manners, the phenomenon is no less singular. Let either side be taken, and a sort of miracle must be admitted. In the instances above given, such a beautiful mixture there is of simplicity and dignity, and so much life given to the manners described, that real manners were never represented with a more striking appearance of truth. If these manners be fictitious, I say again, that the author must have been inspired: they plainly exceed the invention of a savage; nay, they exceed the invention of any known writer. Every man will judge for himself: it is perhaps fondness for such refined manners, that makes me incline to reality against fiction.

I am aware at the same time, that manners so pure and elevated, in the first stage of society, are difficult to be accounted for. The Caledonians were not an original tribe, to found a supposition that they might have manners peculiar to themselves: they were a branch of the Celtae, and had a language common to them with the inhabitants of Gaul, and of England. The manners probably of all were the same, or nearly so; and if we expect any light for explaining Caledonian manners, it must be from that quarter: we have indeed no other resource. Diodorus Siculus (a) reports of the Celtae, that, tho' warlike, they were upright in their dealings, and far removed from deceit and duplicity. Cæsar (b), "*Galli homines aperti minimeque insidiosi, qui*

(a) Lib. 5.

(b) De bello Africo.

“per virtutem, non per dolum, dimicare consueverunt *.” And tho’ cruel to their enemies, yet Pomponius Mela (a) observes, that they were kind and compassionate to the suppliant and unfortunate. Strabo (b) describes the Gauls, as studious of war, and of great alacrity in fighting; otherwise an innocent people, altogether void of malignity. He says, that they had three orders of men, bards, priests, and druids; that the province of the bards was to study poetry, and to compose songs in praise of their deceased heroes; that the priests presided over divine worship; and that the druids, beside studying moral and natural philosophy, determined all controversies, and had some direction even in war. Cæsar, less attentive to civil matters, comprehends these three orders under the name of *druids*; and observes, that the druids teach their disciples a vast number of verses, which they must get by heart. Diodorus Siculus says, that the Gauls had poets termed *bards*, who sung airs accompanied with the harp, in praise of some, and dispraise of others. Lucan, speaking of the three orders, says,

“Vos quoque, qui fortes animas, belloque preemptas,

“Laudibus in longum, vates, dimittitis ævum,

“Plurima securi fudistis carmina bardis †.”

* “The Gauls are of an open temper, not at all insidious; and in fight they rely on valour, not on stratagem.”

† “You too, ye bards! whom sacred raptures fire,

“To chant your heroes to your country’s lyre;

“Who consecrate in your immortal strain,

“Brave patriot souls, in righteous battle slain.

“Securely now the tuneful task renew,

“And noblest themes in deathless songs pursue.”

ROWE.

(a) Lib. 3.

(b) Lib. 4.

With

With respect to the Celtic women in particular, it is agreed by all writers, that they were extremely beautiful (a). They were no less remarkable for spirit than for beauty. If we can rely on Diodorus Siculus, the women in Gaul equalled the men in courage. Tacitus, in his life of Agricola, says, that the British women frequently joined with the men, when attacked by an enemy. And so much were they regarded, as to be thought capable of the highest command. "Neque enim sexum in imperiis discernunt *," says the same author (b). And accordingly, during the war carried on by Caractacus, a gallant British King, against the Romans, Cartimandua was Queen of the Brigantes. Boadicea is recorded in Roman annals as a queen of a warlike spirit. She led on a great army against the Romans; and in exhorting her people to behave with courage, she observed, that it was not unusual to see a British army led on to battle by a woman; to which Tacitus adds his testimony: "Solitum quidem Britannis foeminarum ductu bellare † (c)." No wonder that Celtic women, so amply provided with spirit, as well as beauty, made a capital figure in every public entertainment (d).

The Gallic Celtae undoubtedly carried with them their manners and customs to Britain, and spread them gradually from south to north. And as the Caledonians, inhabiting a mountainous country in the northern parts of the island, had little commerce with other nations, they preserved long in purity many Celtic customs,

* "They made no distinction of sex in conferring authority."

† "The Britons even follow'd women as leaders in the field."

(a) Diodorus Siculus, lib. 5. Athenæus, lib. 13.

(b) Vita Agricola, cap. 16.

(c) Annalium lib. 14.

(d) Athenæus, lib. 10.

particularly that of retaining bards. All the chieftains had bards in their pay, whose province it was to compose songs in praise of their ancestors, and to accompany those songs with the harp. This entertainment enflamed their love for war, and at the same time softened their manners, which, as Strabo reports, were naturally innocent and void of malignity. It had beside a wonderful influence in forming virtuous manners: the bards, in praising deceased heroes, would naturally select virtuous actions, which make the best figure in heroic poetry, and tend the most to illustrate the hero of their song: vice may be flattered; but praise is never willingly nor successfully bestow'd upon any atchievement but what is virtuous and heroic. It is accordingly observed by Ammianus Marcellinus (a), that the bards inculcated in their songs virtue and actions worthy of praise. The bards, who were in high estimation, became great proficient in poetry; of which we have a conspicuous instance in the works of Ossian. Their capital compositions were diligently studied by those of their own order, and much admired by all. The songs of the bards, accompanied with the harp, made a deep impression on the young warrior, elevated some into heroes, and promoted virtue in every hearer*. Another circumstance concurred to form Caledonian manners, common to them with every nation in the first stage of society; which is, that avarice was unknown among them. People in that stage, ignorant of habitual wants, and having a ready supply of all that nature requires, have little notion of property, and not the slight-

* Polydore Virgil says, *Hiberni sunt musica peritissimi*. — [In English thus: "The Irish are most skilful in music." — Ireland was peopled from Britain; and the music of that country must have been derived from British bards. The Welsh bards were the great champions of independence; and in particular promoted an obstinate resistance to Edward I. when he carried his arms into Wales. And hence the tradition, that the Welsh bards were all slaughtered by that King.

(a) Lib. 15.

est notion of accumulating the goods of fortune; and for that reason are always found honest and disinterested. With respect to the female sex, who make an illustrious figure in Ossian's poems, if they were so eminent both for courage and beauty as they are represented by the best authors, it is no wonder that they are painted by Ossian as objects of love the most pure and refined. Nor ought it to be overlooked, that the soft and delicate notes of the harp have a tendency to purify manners, and to refine love.

Whether the causes here assigned of Celtic manners be fully adequate, may well admit of a doubt; but if authentic history be relied on, we can entertain no doubt, that the manners of the Gallic and British Celtæ, including the Caledonians, were such as are above described. And as the manners ascribed by Ossian to his countrymen the Caledonians, are in every particular conformable to those now mentioned, it clearly follows, that Ossian was no inventor, but drew his pictures of manners from real life. This is made highly probable from intrinsic evidence, the same that is so copiously urged above: and now by authentic history that probability is so much heightened as scarce to leave room for a doubt.

Our present highlanders are but a small part of the inhabitants of Britain; and they have been sinking in their importance, from the time that arts and sciences made a figure, and peaceable manners prevailed. And yet in that people are discernible many remaining features of their forefathers the Caledonians. They have to this day a disposition to war, and when disciplined make excellent soldiers, sober, active, and obedient. They are eminently hospitable; and the character given by Strabo of the Gallic Celtæ, that they were innocent, and devoid of malignity, is to them perfectly applicable. That they have not the magnanimity and heroism of the Caledonians, is easily accounted for. The Caledonians were a free and independent people, unaw'd by any superior power, and living under the mild government of their own

chieftains: compared with their forefathers, the present highlanders make a very inconsiderable figure: their country is barren; and at any rate is but a small part of a potent kingdom; and their language deprives them of intercourse with their polished neighbours.

There certainly never happened in literature, a discovery more extraordinary than the works of Ossian. To lay the scene of action among hunters in the first stage of society, and to bestow upon such a people a system of manners that would do honour to the most polished state, seemed at first an ill-contrived forgery. But if a forgery, why so bold and improbable? why not invent manners more congruous to the savage state? And as at any rate the work has great merit, why did the author conceal himself? These considerations roused my attention, and produced the foregoing disquisition; which I finished, without imagining that any more light could be obtained. But after a long interval, a thought struck me, that as the Caledonians formerly were much connected with the Scandinavians, the manners of the latter might probably give light in the present enquiry. I cheerfully spread my sails in a wide ocean, not without hopes of importing precious merchandise. Many volumes did I turn over of Scandinavian history; especially where the manners of the inhabitants in the first stage of society are delineated; and now I proceed to present my reader with the fruits of my labour.

The Danes, says Adam of Bremen, are remarkable for elevation of mind: the punishment of death is less dreaded by them than that of whipping. "The philosophy of the Cimbri," says Valerius Maximus, "is gay and resolute: they leap for joy in a battle, hoping for a glorious end: in sickness they lament, for fear of the contrary." What fortified their courage was a persuasion, that those who die in battle fighting bravely, are instantly translated to the hall of Odin, to drink beer out of the skull of an

an enemy. "Happy in their mistake," says Lucan, "are the people who live near the pole: persuaded that death is only a passage to long life, they are undisturbed by the most grievous of all fears, that of dying: they eagerly run to arms, and esteem it cowardice to spare a life they shall soon recover in another world." Such was their magnanimity, that they scorned to snatch a victory by surprise. Even in their piratical expeditions, instances are recorded of setting aside all the ships that exceeded those of the enemy, lest the victory should be attributed to superiority of numbers. It was held unmanly to decline a combat, however unequal; for courage, it was thought, rendered all men equal. The shedding tears was unmanly, even for the death of friends.

The Scandinavians were sensible in a high degree to praise and reproach; for love of fame was their darling passion. Olave, King of Norway, placing three of his scalds or bards around him in a battle, "You shall not relate," said he, "what you have only heard, but what you are eye-witnesses of." Upon every occasion we find them insisting upon glory, honour, and contempt of death, as leading principles. The bare suspicion of cowardice, was attended with universal contempt: a man who lost his buckler, or received a wound behind, durst never again appear in public. Frotho King of Denmark, taken captive in a battle, obstinately refused either liberty or life. "To what end," says he, "should I survive the disgrace of being made a captive? Should you even restore to me my sister, my treasure, and my kingdom, would these benefits restore me to my honour? Future ages will always have it to say, that Frotho was taken by his enemy (a)."

Much efficacy is above ascribed to the songs of Caledonian

(a) Saxo Grammaticus.

bards; and with satisfaction I find my observations justified in every Scandinavian history. The Kings of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, are represented in ancient chronicles as constantly attended with scalds or bards; who were treated with great respect, especially by princes distinguished in war. Harold Harfager at his feasts placed them above all his other officers; and employed them in negotiations of the greatest importance. The poetic art, held in great estimation, was cultivated by men of the first rank. Rogvald, Earl of Orkney, passed for an able poet. King Regnar was distinguished in poetry, no less than in war. It was the proper province of bards in Scandinavia, as in other countries, to celebrate in odes the achievements of deceased heroes. They were frequently employ'd in animating the troops before a battle. Hacon, Earl of Norway, in his famous engagement against the warriors of Iomsburg, had five celebrated poets, each of whom sung an ode to the soldiers ready to engage. Saxo Grammaticus, describing a battle between Waldemar and Sueno, mentions a scald belonging to the former, who, advancing to the front of the army, reproached the latter in a pathetic ode as the murderer of his own father.

The odes of the Scandinavian bards have a peculiar energy; which is not difficult to be accounted for. The propensity of the Scandinavians to war, their love of glory, their undaunted courage, and their warlike exploits, naturally produced elevated sentiments, and an elevated tone of language; both of which were display'd in celebrating heroic deeds. Take the following instances. The first is from the Edda, which contains the birth and genealogy of their gods. "The giant Rymer arrives from the east, "carried in a chariot: the great serpent, rolling himself furiously in the waters, lifteth up the sea. The eagle screams, and "with his horrid beak tears the dead. The vessel of the gods is "set afloat. The black prince of fire issues from the south, fur-
"rounded

"rounded with flames: the swords of the gods beam like the sun:
 "shaken are the rocks, and fall to pieces. The female giants
 "wander about weeping: men in crowds tread the paths of death:
 "Heaven is split asunder, the sun darkened, and the earth sunk
 "in the ocean. The shining stars vanish: the fire rages: the
 "world draws to an end; and the flame ascending licks the vault
 "of heaven. From the bosom of the waves an earth emerges,
 "clothed with lovely green: the floods retire: the fields produce
 "without culture: misfortunes are banished from the world.
 "Balder and his brother, gods of war, return to inhabit the
 "ruin'd palace of Odin. A palace more resplendent than the sun,
 "rises now to view; adorned with a roof of gold: there good
 "men shall inhabit; and live in joy and pleasure through all
 "ages." In a collection of ancient historical monuments of the
 north, published by Biorner, a learned Swede, there is the fol-
 lowing passage. "Grunder, perceiving Grymer rushing furious-
 "ly through opposing battalions, cries aloud, *Thou alone remainest*
 "*to engage with me in single combat. It is now thy turn to feel the*
 "*keenness of my sword.* Their sabres, like dark and threatening
 "clouds, hang dreadful in the air. Grymer's weapon darts down
 "like a thunderbolt: their swords furiously strike: they are
 "bathed in gore. Grymer cleaves the casque of his enemy, hews
 "his armour in pieces, and pours the light into his bosom.
 "Grunder sinks to the ground; and Grymer gives a dreadful
 "shout of triumph." This picture is done with a masterly hand.
 The capital circumstances are judiciously selected; and the nar-
 ration is compact and rapid. Indulge me with a moment's pause
 to compare this picture with one or two in Ossian's manner. "As
 "autumn's dark storms pour from two echoing hills; so to each
 "other approach the heroes. As from high rocks two dark
 "streams meet, and mix and roar on the plain; so meet Lochlin
 "and Innis-fail, loud, rough, and dark in battle. Chief mixes
 "his

"his strokes with chief, and man with man; steel sounds on
 "steel, helmets are cleft on high. Blood bursts, and smoaks a-
 "round. Strings murmur on the polished yew. Darts rush a-
 "long the sky. Spears fall like sparks of flame that gild the
 "stormy face of night. As the noise of the troubled ocean when
 "roll the waves on high, as the last peal of thundering heaven,
 "such is the noise of battle. Tho' Cormac's hundred bards were
 "there, feeble were the voice of an hundred bards to send the
 "deaths to future times; for many were the heroes who fell, and
 "wide poured the blood of the valiant." Again, "As roll a
 "thousand waves to the rocks, so came on Swaran's host; as
 "meets a rock a thousand waves, so Innis-fail met Swaran. The
 "voice of death is heard all around, and mixes with the sound
 "of shields. Each hero is a pillar of darkness, and the sword a
 "beam of fire in his hand. From wing to wing echoes the field,
 "like a hundred hammers that rise by turns on the red sun of the
 "furnace. Who are those on Lena's heath, so gloomy and dark?
 "they are like two clouds, and their swords lighten above. Who
 "is it but Ossian's son, and the car-borne chief of Erin?" These
 two descriptions make a deeper impression, and swell the heart
 more than the former: they are more poetical by short similes
 finely interwoven; and the images are far more lofty. And yet
 Ossian's chief talent is sentiment, in which Scandinavian bards are
 far inferior: in the generosity, tenderness, and humanity of his
 sentiments, he has not a rival.

The ancient Scandinavians were undoubtedly a barbarous people
 compared with the southern nations of Europe; but that they
 were far from being gross savages, may be gathered from a poem
 still extant, named *Havamaal*; or, *The sublime discourse of Odin*. Tho'
 that poem is of great antiquity, it is replete with good lessons and
 judicious reflections; of which the following are a specimen.

Happy he who gains the applause and good will of men.

Love

Love your friends, and love also their friends.

Be not the first to break with your friend: sorrow gnaws the heart of him who has not a single friend to advise with.

Where is the virtuous man that hath not a failing? Where is the wicked man that hath not some good quality?

Riches take wing: relations die: you, yourself shall die. One thing only is out of the reach of fate, which is, the judgement that passes on the dead.

There is no malady more severe than the being discontented with one's lot.

Let not a man be overwise nor overcurious: if he would sleep in quiet, let him not seek to know his destiny.

While we live, let us live well: a man lights his fire, but before it be burnt out death may enter.

A coward dreams that he may live for ever: if he should escape every other weapon, he cannot escape that of old age.

The flocks know when to retire from pasture: the glutton knows not when to retire from the feast.

The lewd and dissolute make a mock of every thing, not considering how much they deserve to be mocked.

The best provision for a journey is strength of understanding: more useful than treasure, it welcomes one to the table of the stranger.

Hitherto the manners of the Scandinavians resemble in many capital circumstances those delineated in the works of Ossian. I lay not, however great stress upon that resemblance, because such manners are found among several other warlike nations in the first stage of society. The circumstance that has occasioned the greatest doubt about Ossian's system of manners, is the figure his women make. Among other savage nations, they are held to be beings of an inferior rank; and as such are treated with very little respect: in Ossian they make an illustrious figure, and are highly

regarded by the men. I have not words to express my satisfaction, when I discovered, that anciently among the barbarous Scandinavians, the female sex made a figure no less illustrious. A resemblance so complete with respect to a matter extremely singular among barbarians, cannot fail to convert the most obstinate infidel, leaving no doubt of Offian's veracity. — But I ought not to anticipate. One cannot pass a verdict till the evidence be summed up; and to that task I now proceed, with sanguine hopes of success.

It is a fact ascertained by many writers, That women in the north of Europe were eminent for resolution and courage. Cæsar, in the first book of his Commentaries, describing a battle he fought with the Helvetii, says, that the women with a warlike spirit exhorted their husbands to persist, and placed the waggons in a line to prevent their flight. Florus and Tacitus mention, that several battles of those barbarous nations were renewed by their women, presenting their naked bosoms, and declaring their abhorrence of captivity. Flavius Vopiscus, writing of Proculus Cæsar, says, that a hundred Sarmatian virgins were taken in battle. The Longobard women, when many of their husbands were cut off in a battle, took up arms, and obtained the victory (a). The females of the Galactophagi, a Scythian tribe, were as warlike as the males, and went often with them to war (b). In former times, many women in Denmark applied themselves to arms (c). Jordanes describes the women of the Goths as full of courage, and trained to arms like the men. Joannes Magnus, Archbishop of Upsal, says the same; and mentions in particular an expedition of the Goths to invade a neighbouring country, in which more wo-

(a) Paulus Diaconus.

(b) Nicolaus Damascenus.

(c) Saxo Grammaticus.

men went along with the men than were left at home (a). Several Scandinavian women exercised piracy (b). The Cimbri were always attended with their wives even in their distant expeditions, and were more afraid of their reproaches than of the blows of the enemy. The Goths, compelled by famine to surrender to Belisarius the city of Ravenna, were bitterly reproached by their wives for cowardice (c). In a battle between Regner King of Denmark and Fro King of Sweden, many women took part with the former, Langertha in particular, who fought with her hair flowing about her shoulders. Regner, being victorious, demanded who that woman was who had behaved so gallantly; and finding her to be a virgin of noble birth, he took her to wife. He afterward divorced her, in order to make way for a daughter of the King of Sweden. Regner being unhappily engaged in a civil war with Harald, who aspired to the throne of Denmark, Langertha, overlooking her wrongs, brought from Norway a body of men to assist her husband; and behaved so gallantly, that, in the opinion of all, Regner was indebted to her for the victory.

To find women in no inconsiderable portion of the globe dropping their timid nature, and rivalling men in their capital property of courage, is a singular phenomenon. That this phenomenon must have had an adequate cause, is certain; but of that cause, it is better to acknowledge our utter ignorance, however mortifying, than to squeeze out conjectures that will not bear examination.

In rude nations, prophets and soothsayers are held to be a superior class of men: what a figure then must the Vandal women

(a) Book 1.

(b) Olaus Magnus.

(c) Procopius, *Historia Gothica*, lib. 2.

have made, when in that nation, as Procopius says, all the prophets and soothsayers were of the female sex. In Scandinavia, women are said to have been skilful in magic arts, as well as men. Tacitus informs us, that the Germans had no other physicians but their women. They followed the armies, to staunch the blood, and suck the wounds of their husbands*. He mentions a fact that sets the German women in a conspicuous light, That female hostages bound the Germans more strictly to their engagements than male hostages. He adds, "Inesse quin etiam sanctum aliquid et providum putant: nec aut consilia earum aspernantur, aut responsa negliguntur †." The histories and romances of the north represent women, and even princesses, acting as physicians in war.

Polygamy sprung up in countries where women are treated as inferior beings: it can never take place where the two sexes are held to be of equal rank. For that reason, polygamy never was known among the northern nations of Europe. Saxo Grammaticus, who wrote the history of Denmark in the twelfth century, gives not the slightest hint of polygamy, even among kings and princes. Crantz, in his history of the Saxons (a), affirms, that polygamy was never known among the northern nations of Eu-

* The expression of Tacitus is beautiful: "Ad matres, ad conjuges, vulnera ferunt: nec illæ numerare aut exfugere plagas pavent: cibosque et hortamina pugnantibus gestant."—[In English thus: "When wounded, they find physicians in their mothers and wives, who are not afraid to count and suck their wounds. They carry provisions for their sons and husbands, and animate them in battle by their exhortations."]

† "They believe that there is something sacred in their character, and that they have a foresight of futurity: for this reason their counsels are always respected; nor are their opinions ever disregarded."

(a) Lib. 1. cap. 2.

rope ; which is confirmed by every other writer who gives the history of any of those nations. Scheffer in particular, who writes the history of Lapland, observes, that neither polygamy nor divorce were ever heard of in that country, not even during Paganism.

We have the authority of Procopius (a), that the women in those countries were remarkable for beauty, and that those of the Goths and Vandals were the finest that ever had been seen in Italy ; and we have the authority of Crantz, that chastity was in high estimation among the Danes, Swedes, and other Scandinavians. When these facts are added to those above mentioned, it will not be thought strange, that love between the sexes, even among that rude people, was a pure and elevated passion. That it was in fact such, is certain, if history can be credited, or the sentiments of a people expressed in their poetical compositions. I begin with the latter, as evidence the most to be rely'd on. The ancient poems of Scandinavia contain the warmest expressions of love and regard for the female sex. In an ode of King Regner Lodbrog, a very ancient poem, we find the following sentiments. " We fought with swords upon a promontory of England, when I saw ten thousand of my foes rolling in the dust. A dew of blood distilled from our swords : the arrows, that flew in search of the helmets, hissed through the air. The pleasure of that day was like the clasping a fair virgin in my arms." Again, " A young man should march early to the conflict of arms ; in which consists the glory of the warrior. He who aspires to the love of a mistress, ought to be dauntless in the clash of swords." These Hyperboreans, it would appear, had early learned to combine the ideas of love and of military prowess ; which is still more conspicuous in an ode of Harald the Valiant, of a later date. That

(a) Historia Gothica, lib. 3.

prince, who made a figure in the middle of the eleventh century, traversed all the seas of the north, and made piratical incursions even upon the coasts of the Mediterranean. In this ode he complains, that the glory he had acquired made no impression on Ellfir, daughter to Jarillas, King of Russia. "I have made the tour of Sicily. My brown vessel, full of mariners, made a swift progress. My course I thought would never slacken — and yet a Russian maiden scorns me. The troops of Drontheim, which I attacked in my youth, exceeded ours in number. Terrible was the conflict: I left their young king dead on the field — and yet a Russian maiden scorns me. Eight exercises I can perform: I fight valiantly: firm is my seat on horseback: insured I am to swimming: swift is my motion on scates: I dart the lance: I am skilful at the oar — and yet a Russian maiden scorns me. Can she deny, this young and lovely maiden, that near a city in the south I joined battle, and left behind me lasting monuments of my exploits? — and yet a Russian maiden scorns me. My birth was in the high country of Norway, famous for archers: but ships were my delight; and, far from the habitations of men, I have traversed the seas from north to south — and yet a Russian maiden scorns me." In the very ancient poem of Havamaal, mentioned above, there are many expressions of love to the fair sex. "He who would gain the love of a maiden, must address her with smooth speeches, and flowy gifts. It requires good sense to be a skilful lover." Again, "If I aspire to the love of the chastest virgin, I can bend her mind, and make her yield to my desires." The ancient Scandinavian chronicles present often to our view young warriors endeavouring to acquire the favour of their mistresses, by boasting of their accomplishments, such as their dexterity in swimming and scating, their talent in poetry, their skill in chess, and their knowing all the stars by name. Mallet, in the introduction to his history

history of Denmark, mentions many ancient Scandinavian novels that turn upon love and heroism. These may be justly held as authentic evidence of the manners of the people: it is common to invent facts; but it is not common to attempt the inventing manners.

It is an additional proof of the great regard paid to women in Scandinavia, that in Edda, the Scandinavian Bible, female deities make as great a figure as male deities.

Agreeable to the manners described, we find it universally admitted among the ancient Scandinavians, that beauty ought to be the reward of courage and military skill. A warrior was thought intitled to demand in marriage any young woman, even of the highest rank, if he overcame his rivals in single combat: nor was it thought any hardship on the young lady to be yielded to the victor. The ladies were not always of that opinion; for the stoutest fighter is not always the handsomest fellow, nor the most engaging. And in the histories of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, many instances are related, of men generously interposing to rescue young beauties from brutes, destitute of every accomplishment but strength and boldness. Such stories have a fabulous air; and many of them probably are mere fables. Some of them however have a strong appearance of truth: men are introduced who make a figure in the real history of the country; and many circumstances are related that make links in the chain of that history. Take the following specimen. The ambassadors of Frotho, King of Denmark, commissioned to demand in marriage the daughter of a King of the Hunns, were feasted for three days, as the custom was in ancient times; and being admitted to the young Princess, she rejected the offer; "Because," says she, "your King has acquired no reputation in war, but passes his time effeminately at home." In Biorner's collection of ancient historical monuments, mentioned above, there is the following history.

Yoflid

Charles.

Charles King of Sweden kept on foot an army of chosen men. His Queen had born him a daughter named *Inguegerda*, whose lively and graceful accomplishments were admired still more than her birth and fortune. The breast of the King overflow'd with felicity. Grymer, a youth of noble birth, knew to dye his sword in the blood of his enemies, to run over craggy mountains, to wrestle, to play at chess, and to trace the motions of the stars. He studied to show his skill in the apartment of the damsels, before the lovely *Inguegerda*. At length he ventured to open his mind. "Wilt thou, O fair Princess! accept of me for a husband, if I obtain the King's consent?" "Go," says she, "and supplicate my father." The courtly youth, respectfully addressing the King, said, "O King! give me in marriage thy beautiful daughter." He answered sternly, "Thou hast learned to handle thy arms: thou hast acquired some honourable distinctions: but hast thou ever gained a victory, or given a banquet to savage beasts that rejoice in blood?" "Where shall I go, O King! that I may dye my sword in crimson, and render myself worthy of being thy son-in-law?" "Hialmar, son of Harec," said the King, "who governs Biarmland, has become terrible by a keen sword: the firmest shields he hews in pieces, and loads his followers with booty. Go, and prove thy valour, by attacking that hero: cause him to bite the dust, and *Inguegerda* shall be thy reward." Grymer, returning to his fair mistress, saluted her with ardent looks of love. "What answer hast thou received from the King?" "To obtain thee I must deprive the fierce Hialmar of life." *Inguegerda* exclaimed with grief, "Alas! my father hath devoted thee to death." Grymer selected a troop of brave warriors, eager to follow him. They launch their vessels into the wide ocean: they unfurl the sails, which catch the springing gale: the shrouds rattle: the waves foam, and dash against the prows: they steer their numerous vessels to the shore of

of Gothland; bent to glut the hungry raven, and to gorge the wolf with prey. Thus landed Grymer on Gothland; and thus did a beauteous maiden occasion the death of many heroes. Hialmar demanded who the strangers were. Grymer told his name; adding, that he had spent the summer in quest of him. "May your arrival, reply'd Hialmar, be fortunate; and may health and honour attend you. You shall partake of my gold, with the unmixed juice of the grape. Thy offers, said Grymer, I dare not accept. Prepare for battle; and let us hasten to give a banquet to beasts of prey. Hialmar laid hold of his white cuirass, his sword, and his buckler. Grymer, with a violent blow of his sabre, transfixes Hialmar's shield, and cuts off his left hand. Hialmar enraged, brandishes his sword, and striking off Grymer's helmet and cuirass, pierces his breast and sides: an effusion of blood following the wounds. Grymer raising his sabre with both hands, lays Hialmar prostrate on the ground; and he himself sinks down upon the dead body of his adversary. He was put on shipboard, and seemed to be at the last period of life when he landed. The distressed Princess undertook his cure; and restored him to health. They were married with great solemnity; and the beauteous bride of Grymer filled the heart of her hero with unfading joy."

According to the rude manners of those times, a lover did not always wait for the consent of his mistress. Joannes Magnus, Archbishop of Upsal, observes, in his history of the Goths, that ravishing of women was of old no less frequent among the Scandinavians than among the Greeks. He relates, that Gram, son to the King of Denmark, carried off the King of Sweden's daughter, whose beauty was celebrated in verses existing even in his time. Another instance he gives, of Nicolaus King of Denmark (a),

(a) Book 18.

who courted Ulukla, a noble and beautiful Norwegian lady, and obtained her consent. Nothing remained but the celebration of the nuptials, when she was carried off by Suercher, King of Sweden. We have the authority of Saxo Grammaticus, that Skiold, one of the first Kings of Denmark, fought a duel for a beautiful young woman, and obtained her for a wife. That author relates many duels of the same kind. It was indeed common among the Scandinavians, before they became Christians, to fight for a wife, and to carry off the desired object by force of arms. No cause of war between neighbouring kings was more frequent. Fridlevus King of Denmark sent a solemn embassy to Hasmundus King of Norway, to demand in marriage his daughter. Hasmundus had a rooted aversion to the Danes, who had done much mischief in his country. "Go," says he to the ambassadors, "and demand a wife where you are less hated than in Norway." The young lady, who had no aversion to the match, intreated leave to speak. "You seem," said she, "not to consult the good of your kingdom in rejecting so potent a son-in-law, who can carry by force what he is now applying for by intreaties." The father however continuing obstinate, dismissed the ambassadors. Fridlevus sent other ambassadors, redoubling his intreaties for a favourable answer. Hasmundus said, that one refusal might be thought sufficient; and in a fit of passion put the ambassadors to death. Fridlevus invaded Norway with a potent army; and, after a desperate battle, carried off the lady in triumph.

The figure that women made in the north of Europe by their courage, their beauty, and their chastity, could not fail to produce mutual esteem and love between the sexes: nor could that love fail to be purified into the most tender affection, when their rough manners were smoothed in the progress of society. If love between the sexes prevail in Lapland as much as any where, which is vouched by Scheffer in his history of that country, it must

must be for a reason very different from that now mentioned. The males in Lapland, who are great cowards, have no reason to despise the females for their timidity; and in every country where the women equal the men, mutual esteem and affection naturally take place. Two Lapland odes communicated to us by the author mentioned, leave no doubt of this fact, being full of the tenderest sentiments that love can inspire. The following is a literal translation.

F I R S T O D E.

Kulnafatz my rain-deer,

We have a long journey to go;

The moors are vast,

And we must haste;

Our strength, I fear,

Will fail if we are slow;

And so

Our songs will do.

Kaigé, the watery moor,

Is pleasant unto me,

Though long it be;

Since it doth to my mistress lead,

Whom I adore:

The Kilwa moor

I ne'er again will tread.

III.

Thoughts fill'd my mind

Whilst I thro' Kaigé pass

Swift as the wind,

And my desire,
Wing'd with impatient fire,
My rain-deer, let us haste.

IV.

So shall we quickly end our pleasing pain:
Behold my mistress there,
With decent motion walking o'er the plain:
Kulnassatz my rain-deer,
Look yonder, where
She washes in the lake:
See while she swims,
The waters from her purer limbs
New clearness take.

S E C O N D O D E.

I.

With brightest beams let the sun shine
On Orra moor:
Could I be sure
That from the top o' th' lofty pine
I Orra moor might see,
I to its highest bow would climb,
And with industrious labour try
Thence to descry
My mistress, if that there she be.

II.

Could I but know, amid what flowers,
Or in what shade she stays,
The gaudy bowers,
With all their verdant pride,
Their blossoms and their sprays,

Which

Which make my mistress disappear,
And her in envious darkness hide,
I from the roots and bed of earth would tear.

III.

Upon the raft of clouds I'd ride,
Which unto Orta fly:
O' th' ravens I would borrow wings,
And all the feather'd inmates of the sky;
But wings, alas, are me deny'd,
The stork and swan their pinions will not lend,
There's none who unto Orta brings,
Or will by that kind conduct me befriend.

IV.

Enough, enough! thou hast delay'd
So many summer's days,
The best of days that crown the year,
Which light upon the eye-lids dart,
And melting joy upon the heart:
But since that thou so long hast stay'd,
They in unwelcome darkness disappear,
Yet vainly dost thou me forsake;
I will pursue and overtake.

V.

What stronger is than bolts of steel?
What can more surely bind?
Love is stronger far than it;
Upon the head in triumph she doth sit;
Fetters the mind,
And doth control
The thought and soul.

VI.

VI.

A youth's desire is the desire of wind ;

All his essays

Are long delays :

No issue can they find.

Away fond counsellors, away,

No more advice obtrude :

I'll rather prove

The guidance of blind love ;

To follow you is certainly to stray :

One single counsel, tho' unwise, is good.

In the Scandinavian manners here described is discovered a striking resemblance to those described by Ossian. And as such were the manners of the Scandinavians in the first stage of society, it no longer remains a wonder, that the manners of Caledonia should be equally pure in the same early period. And now every argument above urged in favour of Ossian as a genuine historian has its full weight, without the least counterpoise. It is true, that Caledonian manners appear from Ossian to have been still more polished and refined than those of Scandinavia; but that difference may have proceeded from many causes, which time has buried in oblivion.

I make no apology for insisting so largely on Scandinavian manners; for they tend remarkably to support the credit of Ossian, and consequently to ascertain a fact extremely interesting, that our forefathers were by no means such barbarians as they are commonly held to be. All the inhabitants of Britain were of Celtic extraction; and we have reason to believe, that the manners of Caledonia were the manners of every part of the island, before the inhabitants of the plains were enslaved by the Romans. The only circumstance peculiar to the Caledonians, is their mountainous situation :

tuation: being less exposed to the oppression of foreigners, and farther removed from commerce, they did longer than their southern neighbours preserve their manners pure and untainted.

I have all along considered the poems of Ossian merely in a historical view. In the view of criticism they have been examined by a writer of distinguished taste (a); and however bold to enter a field where he hath reaped laurels, I imagine that there still remain some trifles for me to glean. Two of these poems, *Fingal* and *Temora*, are regular epic poems; and perhaps the single instances of epic poetry moulded into the form of an opera. We have in these two poems both the *Recitativo* and *Aria* of an Italian opera; drop'd indeed in the translation, from difficulty of imitation. Ossian's poems were all of them composed with a view to music; tho' in the long poems mentioned it is probable, that the airs only were accompanied with the harp, the recitative being left to the voice. The poems of Ossian are singular in another respect, being probably the only work now remaining that was composed in the hunter-state. Some songs of that early period may possibly be remaining, but nothing like a regular work. One may advance a step farther, and pronounce, with a high degree of probability, that *Fingal* and *Temora* are the only epic poems that ever were composed in that state. How great must have been the talents of the author, beset with every obstruction to genius, the manners of his country alone excepted; a cold inhospitable climate, with such deformity on the face of the country as scarce to afford a pleasing object; and he himself absolutely illiterate! One, advancing still farther, may venture boldly to affirm, that such a poem as *Fingal* or *Temora* never was composed in any other part of the world under such disadvantageous circumstances.

(a) Doctor Blair, professor of Rhetoric in the college of Edinburgh.

Tho' permanent manners enter not regularly into the present sketch, I am however tempted to add a few words concerning the influence of soil upon the disposition of man, in order to shew the wisdom of Providence, which fits the ground we tread on; not only for supplying our wants, but for improving our manners. The stupidity of the inhabitants of New Holland, mentioned above, is occasioned by the barrenness of their soil, yielding nothing that can be food for man or beast. Day and night they watch the ebb of the tide, in order to dig small fish out of the sand; and sleep in the intervals, without an hour to spare for any other occupation. People in that condition must for ever remain ignorant and brutish. Were all the earth barren like New Holland, all men would be ignorant and brutish, like the inhabitants of New Holland. On the other hand, were every portion of this earth naturally so fertile as spontaneously to feed all its inhabitants, which is the golden age figured by poets, what would follow? Upon the former supposition, man would be a meagre, patient, and timid animal: upon the latter supposition, he would be pampered, lazy, and effeminate. In both cases, he would be stupidly ignorant, and incapable of any manly exertion, whether of mind or body. But the soil of our earth is more wisely accommodated to man, its chief inhabitant. Taking it in general, it is neither so fertile as to supersede labour, nor so barren as to require our whole labour. The laborious occupation of hunting for food, produced originally some degree of industry: and tho' all the industry of man was at first necessary for procuring food, cloathing, and habitation; yet the soil, by skill in agriculture, came to produce plenty with less labour, which to some afforded spare time for thinking of conveniencies. A habit of industry thus acquired, excited many to bestow their leisure-hours upon the arts, proceeding from useful arts to fine arts, and from these to the sciences. Wealth, accumulated by industry, has a wonderful influence

influence upon manners: feuds and war, the offspring of wealth, call forth into action friendship, courage, heroism, and every social virtue, as well as many selfish vices. How like brutes do we pass our time, without once reflecting on the conduct of Providence operating even under our feet!

Diversity of manners, at the same time, enters into the plan of Providence, as well as diversity of talents, of feelings, and of opinions. Our Maker hath given us a taste for variety; and he hath provided objects in plenty for its gratification. Some soils, naturally fertile, require little labour: some soils, naturally barren, require the extremity of labour. But the advantages of such a soil are more than sufficient to counterbalance its barrenness: the inhabitants are sober, industrious, vigorous; and consequently courageous, so far as courage depends on bodily strength*. The disadvantages of a fertile soil, on the contrary, are more than sufficient to counterbalance its advantages: the inhabitants are rendered indolent, weak, and cowardly. Hindostan may seem to be an exception; for tho' it be extremely fertile, the people however are industrious, and export manufactures in great abundance at a very low price. But Hindostan properly is not an exception. The Hindows, who are prohibited by their religion to kill any living creature, must abandon to animals for food a large proportion of land; which obliges them to cultivate what remains with double industry, in order to procure food for themselves. The populousness of their country contributes also to make them in-

* That a barren country is a great spur to industry, appears from Venice and Genoa in Italy, Nuremberg in Germany, and Limoges in France. The sterility of Holland required all the industry of its inhabitants for procuring the necessaries of life; and by that means chiefly they become remarkably industrious. Camden ascribes the success of the town of Halifax in the cloth-manufacture, to its barren soil.

Vol. I. T t dustrious.

dustrious. Arragon was once the most limited monarchy in Europe, England not excepted: the barrenness of the soil was the cause, which rendered the people hardy and courageous. In a preamble to one of their laws, the states declare, that were they not more free than other nations, the barrenness of their country would tempt them to abandon it. Opposed to Arragon stands Egypt, the fertility of which renders the inhabitants soft and effeminate, and consequently an easy prey to every invader *. The fruitfulness of the province of Quito in Peru, and the low price of every necessary, occasioned by its distance from the sea, have plunged the inhabitants into supine indolence, and excessive luxury. The people of the town of Quito in particular have abandoned themselves to every sort of debauchery. The time they have to spare from wine and women, is employed in excessive gaming. In other respects also the manners of a people are influenced by the country they inhabit. A great part of Calabria, formerly populous and fertile, is at present covered with trees and shrubs, like the wilds of America; and the ferocity of its inhabitants correspond to the rudeness of the fields. The same is visible in the inhabitants of Mount Etna in Sicily: the country and its inhabitants are equally rugged.

* Fear impressed by strange and unforeseen accidents, is the most potent cause of superstition. What then made the ancient Egyptians so superstitious? No other country is less liable to strange and unforeseen accidents: no thunder, scarce any rain, perfect regularity in the seasons, and in the rise and fall of the river. So little notion had the Egyptians of variable weather as to be surprised that the rivers of Greece did not overflow like the Nile. They could not comprehend how their fields were watered: rain, they said, was very irregular; and what if Jupiter should take a conceit to send them no rain? The fertility of the soil, and the inaction of the inhabitants during the inundation of the river, enervated both mind and body, and rendered them timid and pusillanimous. Superstition was the offspring of this character, as it is of strange and unforeseen accidents in other countries.

S K E T C H

S K E T C H VIII.

Progress and Effects of LUXURY.

THE wisdom of Providence is in no instance more conspicuous than in adjusting the constitution of man to his external circumstances. Food is extremely precarious in the hunter-state; sometimes superabounding with little fatigue, sometimes failing after great fatigue. A savage, like other animals of prey, has a stomach adjusted to that variety: he can bear a long fast; and gorges voraciously when he has plenty, without being the worse for it. Whence it is, that barbarians, who have scarce any sense of decency, are great and gross feeders *. They are equally addicted to drunkenness; and peculiarly fond of spirituous liquors. Drinking was a fashionable vice in Greece, when Menander, Philémon, and Diphilus, wrote, if we can rely on the translations or imitations of those writers by Plautus and Terence. Diodorus Siculus reports, that in his time the Gauls, like other barbarians, were much addicted to drinking. The ancient Scandinavians, who, like other savages, were intemperate in eating and drinking, swallowed

* In the Iliad of Homer, book 9. Agamemnon calls a council at night in his tent. Before entering on business, they go to supper. (*line 122.*). An embassy to Achilles is resolved on. The ambassadors again sup with Achilles on pork-skins, (*line 271.*). Achilles rejects Agamemnon's offer; and the same night Ulysses and Diomed set out on their expedition to the Trojan camp; returning before day, they had a third supper.

large cups to their gods, and to such of their countrymen as had fallen bravely in battle. We learn from the 25th fable of the Edda, which was their sacred book, that to hold much liquor was reputed a heroic virtue. Contarini the Venetian ambassador, who wrote ann. 1473, says, that the Russians were abandoned to drunkenness; and that the whole race would have been extirpated, had not strong liquors been discharged by the sovereign. The Kamskatkans love fat; and a man entertains his guests by cramming into their mouths fat slices of a seal, or a whale, cutting off with his knife what hangs out.

A habit of fasting long, acquired as above in the hunter-state, made meals in the shepherd-state less frequent than at present, tho' food was at hand. Anciently people fed but once a-day, a fashion that continued even after luxury was indulged in other respects. In the war of Xerxes against Greece, it was pleasantly said of the Abderites, who were burdened with providing for the King's table, that they ought to thank the gods for not inclining Xerxes to eat twice a-day. Plato held the Sicilians to be gluttons for having two meals a-day. Arrian (*a*) observes, that the Tyrrenians had a bad habit of two meals a-day. In the reign of Henry VI. the people of England fed but twice a-day. Hector Boyes, in his history of Scotland, exclaiming against the growing luxury of his cotemporaries, says, that some persons were so gluttonous as to have three meals a-day.

Luxury undoubtedly, and love of society, tended to increase the number of meals beyond what nature requires. On the other hand, there is a cause that abridged the number for some time, which is, the introduction of machines. Bodily strength is essential to a savage, being his only tool; and with it he performs wonders. Machines have rendered bodily strength of little

(*a*) Lib. 4. cap. 16.

importance; and as men labour less than originally, they eat less in proportion *. Listen to Hollinshed the English historian upon that article: "Heretofore there hath been much more time spent in eating and drinking than commonly is in these days; for whereas of old we had breakfasts in the forenoon, beverages or nuntions after dinner, and thereto rear suppers when it was time to go to rest; now these odd repasts, thanked be God, are very well left, and each one contenteth himself with dinner and supper only." Thus, before cookery and luxury crept in, a moderate stomach, occasioned by the abridging bodily labour, made eating less frequent than formerly. But the motion did not long continue retrograde: good cookery, and the pleasure of eating in company, turned the tide; and people now eat less at a time, but more frequently.

Feasts in former times were carried beyond all bounds. William of Malmesbury, who wrote in the days of Henry II. says, "That the English were universally addicted to drunkenness, continuing over their cups day and night, keeping open house, and spending the income of their estates in riotous feasts, where eating and drinking were carried to excess, without any elegance." People who live in a corner, imagine that every thing is peculiar to themselves: what Malmesbury says of the English, is common to all nations, in advancing from the selfishness of savages to a relish for society, but who have not yet learned to bridle their appetites. Leland (a) mentions a feast given by the Archbishop of York, at his installation, in the reign of Edward IV. The following is a specimen: 300 quarters of wheat, 300 tons of ale, 100 tons of wine, 1000 sheep, 104 oxen, 304 calves, 304 swine,

* Before fire-arms were known, people gloried in address and bodily strength, and commonly fought hand to hand. But violent exercises becoming less and less necessary, went insensibly out of fashion.

(a) Collectanea.

2000 geese, 1000 capons, 2000 pigs, 400 swans, 104 peacocks, 1500 hot venison pasties, 4000 cold, 5000 custards hot and cold. Such entertainments are a picture of manners. At that early period, there was not discovered in society any pleasure but that of crouding together in hunting and feasting. The delicate pleasures of conversation, in communicating opinions, sentiments, and desires, were to them utterly unknown. There appeared however, even at that early period, a faint dawn of the fine arts. In such feasts as are mentioned above, a curious desert was sometimes exhibited, termed *jutteitie*, viz. paste moulded into the shape of animals. On a saint's day, angels, prophets, and patriarchs, were set upon the table in plenty. A feast given by Trivultius to Lewis XII. of France, in the city of Milan, makes a figure in Italian history. No fewer than 1200 ladies were invited; and the Cardinals of Narbon and St Severin, with many other prelates, were among the dancers. After dancing followed the feast, to regulate which there were no fewer employ'd than 160 master-households. Twelve hundred officers, in an uniform of velvet, or satin, carried the victuals, and served at the side-board. Every table, without distinction, was served with silver-plate, engraved with the arms of the landlord; and beside a prodigious number of Italian lords, the whole court, and all the household of the King, were feasted. The bill of fare of an entertainment given by Sir Watkin Williams Wynn to a company of 1500 persons, on his coming of age, is a sample of ancient English hospitality, which appears to have nothing in view but crouding and cramming merely. The following passage is from Hollinshed: "That the length and sumptuousness of feasts formerly in use, are not totally left off in England, notwithstanding that it proveth very beneficial to the physicians, who most abound where most excesses and misgovernment of our bodies do appear." He adds, that claret, and other French wines, were despised, and strong wines

wines only in request. The best, he says, were to be found in monasteries; for "that the merchant would have thought his soul "would go straightway to the devil, if he should serve monks with "other than the best." Our forefathers relished strong wine, for the same reason that their forefathers relished brandy. In Scotland, sumptuous entertainments were common at marriages, baptisms, and burials. In the reign of Charles II. a statute was thought necessary to confine them within moderate bounds.

Of old, there was much eating, with little variety: at present, there is great variety, with more moderation. From a household-book of the Earl of Northumberland, in the reign of Henry VIII. it appears, that his family, during winter, fed mostly on salt meat, and salt fish; and with that view there was an appointment of 160 gallons of mustard. On flesh-days through the year, breakfast for my Lord and Lady was a loaf of bread, two manchets, a quart of beer, a quart of wine, half a chine of mutton, or a chine of beef boiled. On meagre days, a loaf of bread, two manchets, a quart of beer, a quart of wine, a dish of butter, a piece of salt fish, or a dish of buttered eggs. During lent, a loaf of bread, two manchets, a quart of beer, a quart of wine, two pieces of salt fish, six bacon'd herring, four white herring, or a dish of sproits. There was as little variety in the other meals, except on festival-days. That way of living was at the time high luxury: a lady's waiting-woman at present would never have done with grumbling at such a table. We learn from the same book, that the Earl had but two cooks for dressing victuals to more than two hundred domestics. In those days, hen, chicken, eapon, pigeon, plover, partridge, were reckoned such delicacies, as to be prohibited except at my Lord's table (a).

But luxury is always creeping on, and delicacies become more familiar. Hollinshed observes, that white meats, milk, butter,

(a) Household-book above mentioned.

and cheese, formerly the chief food of his countrymen, were in his time degraded to be the food of the lower sort; and that the wealthy fed upon flesh and fish. By a roll of the King of Scotland's household-expence, anno 1378, we find, that the art of gelding cattle was known. The roll is in Latin, and the gelt hogs are termed *porcelli eunuchi*. Mention is also made of chickens, which were not common on English tables at that time. Olive oil is also mentioned.

In this progress, cooks, we may believe, came to make a figure. Hollinshed observes, that the nobility, rejecting their own cookery, employ'd as cooks musical-headed Frenchmen and strangers, as he terms them. He says, that even merchants, when they gave a feast, rejected butcher's meat as unworthy of their tables; having jellies of all colours, and in all figures, representing flowers, trees, beasts, fish, fowl, and fruit. Henry Wardlaw Archbishop of St Andrew's, observing the refinements in cookery introduced by James I. of Scotland, who had been eighteen years a prisoner in England, exclaimed against the abuse in a parliament held at Perth 1433: he obtained a law, restraining superfluous diet; and prohibiting the use of baked meat to any under the degree of gentlemen; and permitting it to gentlemen on festival-days only; which baked meat, says the bishop, was never before seen in Scotland. The peasants in Sicily regale themselves with ice during summer. They say, that a scarcity of snow would be more grievous to them than a scarcity of corn, or of wine. Such progress has luxury made, even among the populace. People of fashion in London and in Paris, who employ their whole thoughts on luxurious living, would be surprised to be told, that they are still deficient in that art. In order to advance luxury of the table to the acme of perfection, there ought to be a cook for every dish, as there was in ancient Egypt a physician for every disease.

Barbarous nations, being great eaters, are fond of large joints.

of meat: and love of show retains great joints in fashion, even after meals become more moderate: a wild boar was roasted whole for a supper-dish to Antony and Cleopatra; and when stuffed with poultry and wild-fowl, it was a favourite dish at Rome, termed the *Trojan boar*, in allusion to the Trojan horse. The hospitality of the Anglo-Saxons was sometimes exerted in roasting an ox whole. Great joints are left off gradually, as people become more and more delicate in eating. In France, great joints are less in use than formerly; and in England, the voluminous surloin of roast beef, formerly the pride of the nation, is now in polite families relegated to the side-board. In China, where manners are carried to a high degree of refinement, dishes are composed entirely of minced meat.

In early times, people were no less plain in their houses than in their food. Toward the end of the sixteenth century, when Hollinshed wrote, the people of England were beginning to build with brick and stone. Formerly houses were made of posts wattled together, and plastered with clay to keep out the cold: the roof was straw, sedge, or reed. It was an observation of a Spaniard in Queen Mary's days, "These English have their houses of sticks and dirt, but they fare as well as the King." Hollinshed mentioning multitudes of chimneys lately erected, observes, upon the authority of some old men, that in their younger days there were not above two or three, if so many, in most uplandish towns of the realm, religious houses and manor-places of their lords excepted; but that each made his fire against a rere-dosse in the hall, where he dined, and dressed his meat. From Lord Northumberland's household-book, it would seem, that grates were unknown at that time, and that they burnt their coal upon the hearth: a certain sum is allotted for purchasing wood; because, says the book, coals will not burn without it. There is also a certain sum allotted for purchasing charcoal, that the smoke of the sea-

coal might not hurt the arras. In the fourteenth century, the houses of private persons in Paris, as well as in London, were of wood. The streets of Paris, not being paved, were covered with mud; and yet for a woman to travel those streets in a cart, was held an article of luxury, and as such prohibited by Philip the Fair. Paris is enlarged two thirds since the death of Henry IV. tho' at that time it was perhaps not much less populous than at present.

They were equally plain in their household-furniture. While money was scarce, servants got land instead of wages. An old tenure in England binds the vassal to find straw for the King's bed, and hay for his horse. From Lord Northumberland's household-book, mentioned above, it appears, that the linen allowed for a whole year amounted to no more than seventy ells; of which there were to be eight table-cloths (no napkins) for his Lordship's table, and two towels for washing his face and hands. Pewter vessel was prohibited to be hired, except on Christmas, Easter, St George's day, and Whitsunday. Hollinshed mentions his conversing with old men who remarked many alterations in England within their remembrance; that their fathers, and they themselves formerly, had nothing to sleep on but a straw pallat, with a log of timber for a pillow; a pillow, said they, being thought meet only for a woman in childbed; and that if a man in seven years after marriage could purchase a flock-bed, and a sack of chaff to rest his head upon, he thought himself as well lodged as the lord of the town; who peradventure lay seldom on a bed entirely of feathers. Another thing they remarked, was change of household-vessel from timber plates into pewter, and from wooden spoons into tin or silver.

Nor were they less plain in their dress. By an act of parliament in Scotland, *anno* 1429, none were permitted to wear silk or costly furs, but knights and lords of 200 merks yearly rent. But luxury in dress advanced so fast, that by another act, *anno* 1457, the same dress was permitted to aldermen, bailies, and other good

worthy

worthy men within burgh. And by a third act, anno 1471, it was permitted to gentlemen of L. 100 yearly rent. By a sumptuary law in Scotland, anno 1621, cloth of gold and silver, gold and silver lace, velvet, satin, and other silk stuffs, were prohibited except to noblemen, their wives and children, to lords of parliament, prelates, privy counsellors, lords of manors, judges, magistrates of towns, and to those who have 6000 merks of yearly rent. Such distinctions, with respect to landed rent especially, are invidious; nor can they ever be kept up. James, the first British monarch, was, during infancy, committed to the care of the Dowager-Countess of Mar, who had been educated in France. The King being seized with a cholic in the night-time, his household servants flew to his bed-chamber, men and women, naked as they were born; the Countess alone had a smock.

During the reign of Edward III. the imports into England were not the seventh part of the exports. Our exports at that time were not the seventh part of our present exports; and yet our luxury is such, that with all our political regulations, it is with difficulty that the balance of trade is preserved in our favour.

Men in different ages differ widely in their notions of luxury: every new object of sensual gratification, and every indulgence beyond what is usual, are commonly termed *luxury*; and cease to be luxury when they turn habitual. Thus, every historian, ancient and modern, while he inveighs against the luxury of his own times, wonders at former historians for characterising as luxury what he considers as conveniencies merely, or rational improvements. Hear the Roman historian, talking of the war that his countrymen carried on successfully against Antiochus King of Syria:

"Luxuria enim peregrina origo ab exercitu Asiatico inuenta urbem est. Li primum lectos æratos, vestem stragulam pretiosam, plagulas et alia textilia, et quæ tum magnificæ suppellectilibus habebantur, monopodia et abacos Romanæ advexerunt. Tunc

“*psaltria sambusistriaque, et convivalia ludionum oblectamenta*
 “*addita epulis: epulæ quoque ipsæ et cura et sumptu majore ad-*
 “*parari cœptæ: tum coquus, vilissimum antiquis mancipium esti-*
 “*matione et usu, in pretio esse; et, quod ministerium fuerat,*
 “*ars haberi cœpta. Vix tamen illa, quæ tum conspiciebantur,*
 “*femina erant futuræ luxuriæ * (a).”* Household-furniture at Rome must at that period have been exceedingly plain, when a carpet and a one-footed table were reckoned articles of luxury. When the gelding of bulls and rams was first practised, it was probably considered as abominable luxury. Galvanus Fiamma, who in the fourteenth century wrote a history of Milan his native country, complains, that in his time plain living had given way to luxury and extravagance. He regrets the times of Frederic Barbarossa and Frederic II. when the inhabitants of Milan, a great capital, had but three flesh meals in a week, when wine was a rarity, when the better sort made use of dried wood for candles, and when their shirts were of serge, linen being confined to persons of the highest rank. “Matters,” says he, “are wonderfully changed: linen is a common wear: the women dress in silk, “ornamented frequently with gold and silver; and they wear

“For the Asiatic soldiers first introduced into Rome the foreign luxury. They first brought with them beds ornamented with brazen sculptures, painted coverings, curtains and tapestry, and what were then esteemed magnificent furniture, side-boards, and tables with one foot. Then to the luxury of our feasts were added singing girls, female players on the lute, and morris-dancers: greater care and expence were bestowed upon our entertainments: the cook, whom our forefathers reckoned the meanest slave, became now in high esteem and request; and what was formerly a servile employment, was now exalted into a science. All these however scarcely deserve to be reckoned the seeds or buds of the luxury of after times.”

(a) Tit. Liv. lib. 39. cap. 6.

“gold

"gold pendants at their ears." A historian of the present times would laugh at Fiamma, for stating as articles of luxury what are no more but decent for a tradesman and his wife. John Musso, a native of Lombardy, who also wrote in the fourteenth century, declaims against the luxury of his time, and particularly against the luxury of the citizens of Placentia, his countrymen. "Luxury of the table," says he, "of dress, of houses and household-furniture, in Placentia, begun to creep in after the year 1300. Houses have at present halls, rooms with chimneys, portico's, wells, gardens, and many other conveniencies unknown to our ancestors. A house that has now many chimneys, had none in the last age. The fire was placed in the middle of the house, without any vent for the smoke but the tiles: all the family sat round it, and the victuals were dressed there. The expence of household-furniture is ten times greater than it was sixty years ago. The taste for such expence comes to us from France, from Flanders, and from Spain. Eating-tables, formerly but twelve inches long, are now grown to eighteen. They have tablecloths, with cups, spoons, and forks, of silver, and large knives. Beds have silk coverings and curtains. They have got candles of tallow or wax, in candlesticks of iron or copper. Almost every where there are two fires, one for the chamber and one for the kitchen. Confections have come greatly in use, and sensuality regards no expence." Hollinshed exclaims against the luxury and effeminacy of his time. "In times past," says he, "men were contented to dwell in houses builded of fallow, willow, plumbtree, or elm; so that the use of oak was dedicated to churches, religious houses, princes palaces, noble-mens lodgings, and navigation. But now these are rejected, and nothing but oak any whit regarded. And yet see the change; for when our houses were builded of willow, then had we oaken men; but now that our houses are made of oak, our
" men

“men are not only become willow, but many, thro’ Persian delicacy crept in among us, altogether of straw, which is a fore alteration. In those days, the courage of the owner was a sufficient defence to keep the house in safety; but now, the assurance of the timber, double doors, locks and bolts, must defend the man from robbing. Now have we many chimneys, and our tenderlings complain of rheums, catarrhs, and poses. Then had we none but rere-dosses, and our heads did never ache. For as the smoke in those days was supposed to be a sufficient hardening for the timber of the house; so it was reputed a far better medicine to keep the goodman and his family from the quack or pose, wherewith very few were then acquainted.”

Not many years above fifty, French wine, in the Edinburgh taverns, was presented to the guests in a small tin vessel, measuring about an English pint. A single drinking-glass served a company the whole evening; and the first persons who insisted for a clean glass with every new pint were accused of luxury. A knot of highlanders benighted, wrapped themselves up in their plaids, and lay down on the snow to sleep. A young gentleman making up a ball of snow, used it for a pillow. His father (a), striking away the ball with his foot, “What, Sir,” says he, “are you turning effeminate?” Crantz, describing the kingdom of Norway, and the manners of the people, has the following reflection. “Robustissimos educat viros, qui, nulla frugum luxuria moliti, sapius impugnant alios quam impugnantur *.” In the mountainous island of Rum, one of the western islands of Scotland,

* “It produces a most robust race of men, who are enervated by no luxury of food, and are more prone to attack and harass their neighbours than subjected to their attacks.”

(a) Sir Evan Cameron.

the corn produced serves the inhabitants but a few months in winter. The rest of the year they live on flesh, fish, and milk; and yet are healthy and long-lived. In the year 1768, a man died there, aged 103, who was 50 years old before he ever tasted bread. This old man frequently harangued upon the plain fare of former times, finding fault with his neighbours for indulging in bread; and upbraiding them with their toiling like slaves for the production of such an unnecessary article of luxury.

Thus every one exclaims against the luxury of the present times, judging more favourably of the past; as if what is luxury at present, would cease to be luxury when it becomes customary. What is the foundation of a sentiment so universal? In point of dignity, corporeal pleasures are the lowest of all that belong to our nature; and for that reason, persons of delicacy dissemble the pleasure they take in eating and drinking (a). When corporeal pleasure is indulged to excess, it is not only low, but mean. But as in judging of things that admit of degrees, comparison is the ordinary standard, every refinement in corporeal pleasure beyond what is customary, is held to be an excess, blameable as below the dignity of human nature. Thus every improvement in living is pronounced to be luxury while recent, and drops that character when it comes into common use. For the same reason, what is moderation in the capital, is esteemed luxury in a country-town. Doth luxury then depend entirely on comparison? is there no other foundation for distinguishing moderation from excess? This will hardly be maintained.

This subject is thrown into obscurity by giving different meanings to the term *luxury*. A French writer holds every sort of food to be luxury, but raw flesh and acorns, which were the original food of savages; and every sort of covering to be luxury but

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 356. edit. 3.

skins, which were their original cloathing. According to that definition, the plough, the spade, the loom, are all of them instruments of luxury; and in that view he justly extols luxury to the skies. Let every man enjoy the privilege of giving his own meaning to words: at the same time, when a man deviates so far from their usual meaning, the neglect to define them is inexcusable. In common language, and in common apprehension, luxury always implies a faulty excess; and upon that account is condemned by all writers, such only excepted as affect to be singular.

This is clearly one branch of the definition of luxury. Another is, that the excess must be habitual: a single act of intemperance, however faulty, is not denominated luxury: reiteration must be so frequent as to become a confirmed habit.

Nor are these particulars all that enter into the definition of luxury. There are many pleasures, however intemperate or habitual, that are not branded with that odious name. Mental pleasure, such as arises from sentiment or reasoning, falls not within the verge of luxury, to whatever excess indulged. If to relieve merit in distress be luxury, it is only so in a metaphorical sense: nor is it deemed luxury in a damsel of fifteen to peruse love-novels from morning to evening. Luxury is confined to the external senses: nor does it belong to every one of these; the fine arts have no relation to luxury. A man is not even said to be luxurious, merely for indulging in dress, or in fine furniture. Hollinshed inveighs against drinking-glasses as an article of luxury. At that rate, a house adorned with fine pictures or statues would be an imputation on the proprietor. Thus passing in review every pleasure of external sense, we find, that in proper language the term luxury is not applicable to any pleasure of the eye or ear. That term is confined to the pleasures of taste, touch, and smell, which

which appear as existing at the organ of sense, and upon that account are held to be merely corporeal (a).

Having thus circumscribed our subject within its proper bounds, the important point that remains to be ascertained is, Whether we have any rule for determining what excess in corporeal pleasure may justly be denominated faulty. About that point we are at no loss. Tho' our present life be a state of trial, yet our Maker has kindly indulged us in every pleasure that is not hurtful to the mind, or to the body; and therefore it can only be hurtful excess that falls under the censure of being luxurious. It is faulty as a transgression of self-duty; and as such it is condemned by the moral sense. The most violent declaimer against luxury will not affirm, that bread is luxury, or a snow-ball used for a pillow; for these are innocent, because they do no harm. As little will it be affirmed, that dwelling-houses more capacious than those originally built ought to be condemned as luxury, since they contribute to cheerfulness as well as to health. The plague, some centuries ago, made frequent visits in London, promoted by air stagnating in narrow streets, and small houses. After the great fire anno 1666, the houses and streets were enlarged, and the plague has not once been known in London.

Man consists of soul and body, so intimately connected, that the one cannot be at ease while the other suffers. In order to have *mens sana in corpore sano*, it is necessary to study the health of both; bodily health supports the mind; and nothing tends more than cheerfulness to support the body, even under a disease. To preserve this complicated machine in order, certain exercises are proper for the body, and certain for the mind; which ought never to encroach the one on the other. Much motion and bodily exercise tend to make us robust; but in the mean time the mind

(a) See Elements of Criticism, Introduction.

is starved : much reading and reflection fortify the mind, but in the mean time the body is starved. Nor is this all : excess in either is destructive to both ; for exercise too violent, whether of mind or body, wears the machine. Indolence, on the other hand, relaxes the machine, and renders it weak or languid. Bodily indolence breeds the gout, the gravel, and many other diseases : nor is mental indolence less pernicious, for it breeds peevishness and pusillanimity. Thus, health both of mind and body is best preserved by moderate exercise. And hence a general proposition, That every indulgence in corporeal pleasure, which favours either too violent or too languid exercise, whether of mind or body, is hurtful, and consequently is luxury in its proper sense. It is scarce necessary to be added, that every such indulgence is condemned by the moral sense ; for every man can bear testimony of this from what he himself feels.

Too great indulgence in corporeal pleasure seldom prompts violent exercise ; but instances are without number of its relaxing even that moderate degree of exercise which is healthful both to mind and body. This in particular is the case of too great indulgence in eating or drinking : such indulgence creates a habitual appetite, which demanding more than nature requires, loads the stomach, depresses the spirits, and brings on a habit of listlessness and inactivity, which renders men cowardly and effeminate *. And what does the epicure gain by such excess ? In the grandest palace the master occupies not a greater space than his meanest domestic ; and brings to his most sumptuous feast perhaps less appetite than any of his guests. Satiety withal makes him lose the

* Luxury and selfishness render men cowards. People who are attached to riches, and sensual pleasure, cannot think of abandoning them without horror. A virtuous man considers himself as placed here in order to obey the will of his Maker : he performs his duty, and is ready to quit his post upon the first summons.

relish even of rarities; which afford to others a poignant pleasure. What enjoyment then have the opulent above others? Let them bestow their riches in making others happy: such benevolence will double their own happiness; first, in the direct act of doing good; and next, in reflecting upon the good they have done, the most delicate of all feasts.

Had the English continued Pagans, they would have invented a new deity to preside over cookery. I say it with regret, but must say it, that a luxurious table, covered with every dainty, seems to be their favourite idol. A minister of state never withstands a feast; and the link that unites those in opposition is, the cramming one another. I shall not be surpris'd to hear, that the cramming a mistress has become the most fashionable mode of courtship. That sort of luxury is not unknown in their universities; and it is perhaps the only branch of education that seldom proves abortive. It has not escap'd observation, that between the 1740 and 1770 no fewer than six mayors of London died in office, a greater number than in the preceding 500 years: such havock doth luxury in eating make among the sons of Albion. How different the manners of their forefathers! Bonduca their Queen, ready to engage the Romans in a pitched battle, encouraged her army with a pathetic speech, urging in particular the following consideration: "The great advantage we have over them is, that they cannot, like us, bear hunger, thirst, heat, nor cold. They must have fine bread, wine, and warm houses: every herb and root satisfies our hunger; water supplies the want of wine; and every tree is to us a warm house (a) †."

The

(a) Dion Cassius.

This was compos'd in the year, 1779.

† Providence has provided the gout as a beacon on the rock of luxury to warn

The indulging in down-beds, soft pillows, and easy seats, is a species of luxury, because it tends to enervate the body, and to render it unfit for fatigue. Some London ladies employ an operator for pairing their nails. Two young women of high quality, who were sisters, employ'd a servant with soft hands to raise them gently out of bed in a morning. Nothing less than all-powerful vanity can make such persons submit to the fatigues of a toilet: how can they ever think of submitting to the horrid pangs of child-bearing? In the hot climates of Asia, people of rank are rubbed and chaffed twice a-day; which, beside being pleasant, is necessary for health, by moving the blood, in a hot country, where sloth and indolence prevail. The Greeks and Romans were curried, bathed, and oiled, daily; tho' they had not the same excuse for that practice: it was luxury in them, tho' not in the Asiatics.

With respect to exercise, the various machines that have been invented for executing every sort of work, render bodily strength of less importance than formerly. This change is favourable to mental operations, without hurting bodily health. The travelling on horseback, tho' a less vigorous exertion of strength than walking, is not luxury, because it is a healthful exercise. I dare not say so much for wheel-carriages: a spring-coach, rolling along a smooth road, gives no exercise; or so little, as to be preventive of no disease: it tends to enervate the body, and in some measure also the mind. The increase of wheel-carriages within a century is a pregnant proof of the growth of luxurious indolence. During the reign of James I. the English judges rode to Westminster on horseback, and probably did so for many years after his death. Charles I. against it. But in vain: during distress, vows of temperance are made: during the intervals, these vows are forgot. Luxury has gained too much ground in this island to be restrained by admonition.

issued

issued a proclamation, prohibiting hackney-coaches to be used in London, except by those who travel at least three miles out of town. At the Restoration, Charles II. made his public entry into London on horseback, between his two brothers, Dukes of York and Gloucester. We have Rushworth for our voucher, that in London, not above a hundred years ago, there were but twenty hackney-coaches; which at the same time did not ply on the streets, but were kept at home till called for. He adds, that the King and council published a proclamation against them, because they raised the price of provender upon the King, nobility, and gentry. At present, 1000 hackney-coaches ply on the streets of London, beside a great number of stage-coaches for travelling from London to all parts of the kingdom. The first coach with glasses in France was brought from Bruffels to Paris, *anno* 1660, by the Prince of Condé. Sedan-chairs were not known in England before the year 1634. Cookery and coaches have reduced the military spirit of the English nobility and gentry to a languid state: the former, by overloading the body, has infected them with dispiriting ailments; the latter, by fostering ease and indolence, have banished labour, the only antidote to such ailments. Too great indulgence in the fine arts consumes part of that time which ought to be employ'd on the important duties of life; but the fine arts, even when too much indulged, produce one good effect, which is, to soften and humanize our manners; nor do they harm the body, if they relax not that degree of exercise which is necessary for supporting it in health and vigour.

The enervating effects of luxury upon the body are above all remarkable in war. The officers of Alexander's army were soon tainted with Asiatic manners. Most of them, after bathing, had servants for rubbing them, and instead of plain oil, used precious ointments. Leonatus in particular commissioned from Egypt the powder he used when he wrestled, which loaded several camels.

Alexander

Alexander reproved them mildly: "I wonder that men who have
 "undergone such fatigues in war, are not taught by experience,
 "that labour produces sweeter and sounder sleep than indolence.
 "To be voluptuous is an abject and slavish state. How can a
 "man take care of his horse, or keep his armour bright, who
 "disdains to employ his own hands upon what is dearest to him,
 "his own body (a)?"

When we attend to the mind singly, manifold are the pernicious effects of luxury. Corporeal pleasures, being all of them selfish, tend, when much indulged, to make selfishness the leading principle. Voluptuousness accordingly, relaxing every sympathetic affection, brings on a beastly selfishness, which leaves nothing of man but the external figure. Luxury beside renders the mind so effeminate as to be subdued by every distress: the slightest pain, whether of mind or body, is a real evil: and any higher degree becomes a severe torture. The French are far gone in that disease. Pictures of deep distress, which attract English spectators, are to the French unsupportable: their aversion to pain overcomes the attractive power of sympathy, and debars from the stage every distress that makes a deep impression on the heart. The British are gradually sinking into the same weakness of mind: *Venice preserv'd* collects not such numbers as it did originally; and would scarce be endured at present, were not our sympathy blunted by familiarity: a new play upon a similar plan would not take. The gradual decay of manhood in Britain appears from their funeral rites. Formerly the deceased were attended to the grave by relations and friends of both sexes; and the day of their death was preserved in remembrance with solemn lamentations, as the day of their birth was with exhilarating cups. In England a man was first relieved from attending his deceased wife to the grave; and afterward from at-

(a) Plutarch.

tending his deceased children; and now such effeminacy of mind prevails there, that instantly upon the last groan, the deceased, abandoned by every relation, is delivered to an undertaker by profession, who is left at leisure to mimic the funeral rites. In Scotland, such refinement has not yet taken place: a man is indeed excused from attending his wife to the grave; but he performs that duty in person to every other relation, his children not excepted. I am told, that people of high fashion in England begin to leave the care of their sick relations to hired nurses; and think they do their duty in making short visits from time to time.

Hitherto I have considered luxury with respect to those only who are infected with it; and did its poisonous effects spread no wider, the case perhaps would be the less deplorable. But unhappily, where luxury prevails, the innocent suffer with the guilty. A man of economy, whether a merchant or a manufacturer, lays up a stock for his children, and adds useful members to the state. A man, on the contrary, who lives above his fortune, or his profits, accustoms his children to luxury, and abandons them to poverty when he dies. Luxury at the same time is a great enemy to population: it enhances the expence of living, and confines many to the bachelor-state. Luxury of the table in particular is remarkable for that effect: "L'homme riche met toute sa gloire à consumer, toute sa grandeur à perdre en un jour à sa table plus de biens qu'il n'en faudroit pour faire subsister plusieurs familles. Il abuse également et des animaux et des hommes, dont le reste demeure affamé, languit dans la misère, et ne travaille que pour satisfaire à l'appétit immodéré, et à la vanité encore plus insatiable, de cet homme; qui détruisant les autres par la disette, se détruit lui-même par les excès (a)." To

(a) Buffon.

* "The sole glory of the rich man is, to consume and destroy; and his grandeur

To consider luxury in a political view, no refinement of dress, of the table, of equipage, of habitation, is luxury in those who can afford the expence; and the public gains by the encouragement that is given to arts, manufactures, and commerce. But a mode of living above a man's annual income, weakens the state, by reducing to poverty, not only the squanderers themselves, but many innocent and industrious persons connected with them. Luxury is above all pernicious in a commercial state. A person of moderation is satisfied with small profits: not so the luxurious, who despise every branch of trade but what returns great profits: other branches are ingrossed by foreigners who are more frugal. The merchants of Amsterdam, and even of London, within a century, lived with more economy than their clerks do at present. Their country-houses and gardens make not the greatest articles of their expence. At first, a merchant retires to his country-house on Sundays only and holydays: but beginning to relish indolent retirement, business grows irksome, he trusts all to his clerks, loses the thread of his affairs, sees no longer with his own eyes, and is now in the high way to perdition. Every cross accident makes him totter; and in labouring circumstances he is tempted to venture all in hopes of re-establishment. He falls at last to downright gaming; which, setting conscience aside, is a prudent measure: he risks only the money of his creditors, for he himself has nothing to lose: it is now with him, *Cæsar aut nihil* *. Such a man never falls without involving many in his ruin,

“deur consists, in lavishing in one day upon the expence of his table what would procure subsistence for many families. He abuses equally animals and his fellow-creatures; a great part of whom, a prey to famine, and languishing in misery, labour and toil to satisfy his immoderate desires, and insatiable vanity; who, destroying others by want, destroys himself by excess.”

* “Cæsar or nothing.”

The

The bad effects of luxury above display'd, are not the whole, nor indeed the most destructive. In all times luxury has been the ruin of every state where it prevailed. But that more important branch of the subject is reserved to particular sketches, where it will make a better figure.

In the savage state, man is almost all body, with a very small proportion of mind. In the maturity of civil society, he is complete both in mind and body. In a state of degeneracy by luxury and voluptuousness, he has neither mind nor body *.

* In ancient Egypt, execution against the person of a debtor was prohibited. Such a law could not obtain but among a temperate people, where bankruptcy happens by misfortune, and seldom by luxury or extravagance.

Vol. I.

Y Y

SKETCHES

S K E T C H E S O F T H E H I S T O R Y O F M A N .

B O O K I I .

Progress of M E N in S O C I E T Y .

P R E F A C E .

IN treating of this subject, no opportunity has been omitted of suggesting an important doctrine, That patriotism is the corner-stone of civil society ; that no nation ever became great and powerful without it ; and, when extinguished, that the most powerful nation is in the high-way to contempt and dissolution. But it is sufficient for me to suggest facts : the reader will have frequent opportunities to make the observation ; and he will value his own reflections more than what are inculcated by an author, were he even to ascend the pulpit, and at every turn to pronounce a serious harangue.

S K E T C H

S K E T C H I.

Appetite for SOCIETY.—Origin of NATIONAL SOCIETIES.

That there is in man an appetite for society, never was called in question*. But to what end the appetite serves, whether it be in any manner limited, and how far men are naturally fitted for being useful members of civil society, and for being happy in it,

* This appetite is not denied by Vitruvius; but it seems to have been overlooked in the account he gives (book 2. ch. 1.) of the commencement of society, which is as follows. “ In ancient times, men, like wild beasts, lived in caves and woods, feeding on wild food. In a certain place it happened, that the trees, put in motion by tempestuous winds, and rubbing their branches one against another, took fire. Those in the neighbourhood fled for fear: but as the flames abated, they approached; and finding the heat comfortable, they threw wood into the fire, and preserved it from being extinguished. They then invited others to take benefit of the fire. Men, thus assembled, endeavoured to express their thoughts by articulate sounds; and by daily practice, certain sounds, signifying things in frequent use, came to be established. From that casual event, language arose. And thus, fire having attracted many to one place, they soon discovered that they were by nature superior to other animals, differing from them not only in an erect posture, which gave them opportunity to behold the beauties of the heavens as well as of the earth; but also in their hands and fingers, fitted for executing whatever they could invent. They therefore began to cover their habitations with the boughs of trees; some dug caves in the mountains; and, in imitation of a swallow’s nest, some sheltered themselves with sprigs and loam. Thus, by observing each other’s work, and turning their thoughts to

Y y 2

“ invention,

are questions that open extensive views into human nature, and yet have been little attended to by writers. I grieve at the neglect, because the present enquiry requires an answer to these questions, however abstruse.

As many animals, beside man, are social, it appeared to me probable, that the social laws by which such animals are governed, might open views into the social nature of man. But here I met with a second disappointment: for after perusing books without end, I found very little satisfaction; tho' the laws of animal society make the most instructive and most entertaining part of natural history. A few dry facts, collected occasionally, enabled me to form the embryo of a plan, which I here present to the reader: if his curiosity be excited, 'tis well; for I am far from expecting that it will be gratified.

Animals of prey have no appetite for society, if the momentary act of copulation be not excepted. Wolves make not an exception, even where, instigated by hunger, they join in attacking a village: as fear prevents them singly from an attempt so hazardous, their casual union is prompted by appetite for food, not by appetite for society. So little of the social is there in wolves, that if one happen to be wounded, he is put to death, and devoured by those of his own kind. Vultures have the same disposition. Their ordinary food is a dead carcase; and they never venture but in a body to attack any living creature that appears formidable. Upon society happiness so much depends, that we do not willingly admit a lion, a tiger, a bear, or a wolf, to have any appetite for society. And in withholding it

“invention, they by degrees improved their habitations, and became daily more
“and more skilful.” Has not the celebrated Rousseau been guilty of the same oversight in his essay on the inequality of men? These authors suggest to me the butcher, who made diligent search for his knife, which he held in his teeth.

from

from such animals, the goodness of Providence to its favourite man, is conspicuous: their strength, agility, and voracity, make them singly not a little formidable: I should tremble for the human race, were they disposed to make war in company*.

Such harmless animals as cannot defend themselves singly, are provided with an appetite for society, that they may defend themselves in a body. Sheep are remarkable in that respect, when left to nature: a ram seldom attacks; but the rams of a flock exert great vigour in defending their females and their young †. The whole

* The care of Providence in protecting the human race from animals of prey, is equally visible in other particulars. I can discover no facts to make me believe, that a lion or a tiger is afraid of a man; but whatever secret means are employ'd by Providence, to keep such fierce and voracious animals at a distance, certain it is, that they shun the habitations of men. At present there is not a wild lion in Europe. Even in Homer's time there were none in Peloponnesus, tho' they were frequent in Thrace, Macedon, and Thessaly, down to the time of Aristotle: whence it is probable, that these countries were not at that time well peopled. When men and cattle are together, a lion always attacks a beast, and never a man. M. Buffon observes, that the bear, tho' far from being cowardly, never is at ease but in wild and desert places. The great condor of Peru, a bird of prey of an immense size, bold, and rapacious, is never seen but in deserts and high mountains. Every river in the coast of Guinea abounds with crocodiles, which lie basking in the sun during the heat of the day. If they perceive a man approaching, they plunge into the river, tho' they seldom fly from any other animal. A fox, on the contrary, a pole-cat, a kite, tho' afraid of man, draw near to inhabited places where they find prey in plenty. Such animals do little mischief; and the little they do, promotes care and vigilance. But if men, like sheep, were the natural prey of a lion or a tiger, their utmost vigour and sagacity would scarce be sufficient for self-defence. Perpetual war would be their fate, without having a single moment for any other occupation; and they could never have emerged out of brutal barbarity. It is possible that a few cattle might be protected by armed men, continually on the watch; but to defend flocks and herds covering a hundred hills, would be impracticable. Agriculture could never have existed in any shape.

* M. Buffon has bestowed less pains than becomes an author of his character, upon

whole society of rooks join in attacking a kite when it hovers about them. A family of wild swine never separate till the young be sufficiently strong to defend themselves against the wolf; and when the wolf threatens, they all join in a body. The pecary is a sort of wild hog in the isthmus of Darien: if one of them be attacked, the rest run to assist it. There being a natural antipathy between that animal and the American tiger, it is not uncommon to find a tiger slain with a number of dead pecaries round him.

The social appetite is to some animals useful, not only for defence, but for procuring the necessaries of life. Society among beavers is a notable instance of both. As water is the only refuge of that innocent species against an enemy, they instinctively make their settlement on the brink of a lake or of a running stream. In the latter case, they keep up the water to a proper height by a dam-dike, constructed with so much art as to withstand the greatest floods: in the former, they save themselves the labour of a dam-dike, because a lake generally keeps at the same height. Having thus provided for defence, their next care is to provide food and habitation. The whole society join in erecting the dam-dike; and they also join in erecting houses. Each house has two apartments: in the upper there is space for lodging from six to ten beavers: the under holds their provisions, which are trees

upon the nature and instincts of animals: he indeed scarce once stumbles upon truth in his natural history of the sheep. He holds it to be stupid, and incapable to defend itself against any beast of prey; maintaining, that the race could not have subsisted but under the care and protection of men. Has that author forgot, that sheep had no enemy more formidable than men in their original hunter-state? Far from being neglected by nature, there are few animals better provided for defence. They have a sort of military instinct, forming a line of battle, like soldiers, when threatened with an attack. The rams, who, in a natural state, make half of the flock, join together; and no lion or tiger is able to resist their united impetuosity.

cut

cut down by united labour, and divided into small portable parts (a). Bees are a similar instance. Aristotle (b) says, "that bees are the only animals which labour in common, have a house in common, eat in common, and have their offspring in common." A single bee would be still less able than a single beaver, to build a house for itself and for its winter-food. The Alpine rat or marmot has no occasion to store up food for winter, because it lies benumbed without motion all the cold months. But these animals live in tribes; and each tribe digs a habitation under ground with great art, sufficiently capacious for lodging the whole tribe; covering the ground with withered grass, which some cut, and others carry. The wild dogs of Congo and Angola hunt in packs, waging perpetual war against other wild beasts. They bring to the place of rendezvous whatever is caught in hunting; and each receives its share *. The baboons are social animals, and avail themselves of that quality in procuring food; witness their address in robbing an orchard, described by Kolben in his account of the Cape of Good Hope. Some go into the orchard, some place themselves on the wall, the rest form a line on the outside, and the fruit is thrown from hand to hand, till it reach the place of rendezvous. Extending the enquiry to all known animals, we find that the appetite for society is withheld from no species to which it is necessary, whether for defence, or for food. It appears to be distributed by weight and measure, in

* However fierce with respect to other animals, yet so submissive are these dogs to men, as to suffer their prey to be taken from them without resistance. Europeans salt for their slaves what they thus obtain.

(a) See the works of the beaver described most accurately by M. Buffon, volumes

(b) History of animals, b. 9. c. 40.

order to accommodate the internal frame of animals to their external circumstances.

On some animals an appetite for society is bestow'd, tho' in appearance not necessary either for defence or for food. With regard to such, the only final cause we can discover is the pleasure of living in society. That kind of society is found among horses. Outhier, one of the French academicians employ'd to measure a degree of the meridian toward the north pole, reports, that at Torneo all bulky goods are carried in boats during summer; but in winter, when the rivers are frozen, and the ground covered with snow, that they use sledges drawn by horses; that when the snow melts, and the rivers are open, the horses, set loose, rendezvous at a certain part of the forest, where they separate into troops, and occupy different pasture-fields; that when these fields become bare, they occupy new ground in the same order as at first; that they return home in troops when the bad weather begins; and that every horse knows its own stall. No creature stands less in need of society than a hare, whether for food or for defence. Of food, it has plenty under its feet; and for defence, it is provided both with cunning and swiftness. Nothing however is more common in a moon-light night, than to see hares sporting together in the most social manner. But society for pleasure only, is an imperfect kind of society; and far from being so intimate, as where it is provided by nature for defence, or for procuring food*.

With

* Pigeons must be excepted, if their society be not necessary either for food or habitation, of which I am uncertain. Society among that species is extremely intimate; and it is observable, that the place they inhabit contributes to the intimacy. A crazy dove-cot moved the proprietor to transfer the inhabitants to a new house built for them; and to accustom them to it, they were kept a fortnight within doors, with plenty of food. When they obtained liberty, they flew directly to their

With respect to the extent of the appetite, no social animal, as far as can be discovered, has an appetite for associating with the whole species. Every species is divided into many small tribes; and these tribes have no appetite for associating with each other: on the contrary, a stray sheep is thrust out of the flock, and a stray bee must instantly retire, or be stung to death. Every work of Providence contributes to some good end, and a small tribe is sufficient for mutual defence; and a very large tribe would be difficult, in procuring subsistence.

How far brute animals are by nature fitted for being useful members of civil society, and for being happy in it, is a question that no writer hath so much as stumbled on. And yet, as that branch of natural history is also necessary to my plan, I must proceed; tho' I have nothing to lay before the reader but a few scattered observations, which occurred when I had no view of turning them to account. I begin with the instinctive conduct of animals, in providing against danger. When a flock of sheep in the state of nature goes to rest, sentinels are appointed; who, on appearance of an enemy, stamp with the foot, and make a hissing sound; upon which all take the alarm: if no enemy appear, they watch their time, return to the flock, and send out others in their stead. And in flocks that have an extensive range in hilly countries, the same discipline obtains, even after domestication. Tho' monkeys sleep upon trees, yet a sentinel is always appointed, who must not sleep under pain of being torn to pieces. They preserve the same discipline when they rob an orchard: a sentinel on a high tree is watchful to announce the very first appearance of an enemy. M. Buffon, talking of a sort of monkey which he terms *Mal-*

their old houses, and seeing it laid flat, walked round and round, lamenting. They then took wing and disappeared, without once casting an eye on their new habitation. VOL. I. Z z brouck,

brouck, says, that they are fond of fruit, and of sugar-canes; and that while they are loading themselves, one is placed sentinel on a tree, who, upon the approach of a man, cries, *Houp! Houp! Houp!* loudly and distinctly. That moment they throw away the sugar-canes that they hold in their left hand, and run off upon three feet. When the marmouts are at work in the field, one is appointed to watch on a high rock; which advertises them by a loud whistle, when it sees a man, an eagle, or a dog. Among beavers, notice is given of the approach of an enemy, by lashing the water with the tail, which is heard in every habitation. Seals always sleep on the beach; and to prevent surprise, sentinels are placed round at a considerable distance from the main body. Wild elephants, which always travel in company, are less on their guard in places unfrequented: but when they invade cultivated fields, they march in order, the eldest in the front, and the next in age closing the rear. The weak are placed in the centre, and the females carry their young on their trunk. They attack in a body; and upon a repulse, retire in a body. Tame elephants retain so much of their original nature, that if one, upon being wounded, turn its back, the rest instantly follow. Next in order is the government of a tribe, and the conduct of its members to each other. It is not unlikely, that society among some animals, and their mutual affection, may be so entire as to prevent all discord among them; which indeed seems to be the case of beavers. Such a society, if there be such, requires no government, nor any laws. A flock of sheep occupies the same spot every night, and each hath its own resting-place. The same is observable in horned cattle when folded. And as we find not, that any one ever attempts to dislodge another, it is probable that such restraint makes a branch of their nature. But society among brute animals is not always so perfect. Perverse inclinations, tending to disturb society, are visible among some brute animals, as well as among rational men. It is not

not uncommon for a rook to pilfer sticks from another's nest; and the pilferer's nest is demolished by the *lex talionis*. Perverse inclinations require government, and government requires laws. As in the case now mentioned, the whole society join in inflicting the punishment, government among rooks appears to be republican. Apes, on the contrary, are under monarchical government. Apes in Siam go in troops, each under a leader, who preserves strict discipline. A female carnally inclined, retired from the troop, and was followed by a male. The male escaped from the leader, who pursued them; but the female was brought back, and in presence of the whole troop received fifty blows on the cheek, as a chastisement for its incontinence (a). But probably there are not many instances among brutes of government approaching so near to that of men. Government among horned cattle appears to have no other end but to preserve order. Their government is monarchical; and the election is founded upon personal valour, the most solid of all qualifications in such a society. The bull who aspires to be lord of the herd, must fight his way to preferment; and after all his rivals are beat off the field, the herd tamely submit. At the same time he is not secured in the throne for life; but must again enter the lists with any bull that ventures to challenge him. The same spirit is observable among oxen, tho' in a lower degree. The master-ox leads the rest into the stable, or into the fold, and becomes unruly if he be not let first out: nay, he must be first yoked in the plough or waggon. Sheep are not employ'd in work, but in every other respect the same economy obtains among them. Where the rams happen to be few in proportion to the other sheep, they sometimes divide the flock among them, instead of fighting for precedence. Five or six score of sheep were purchased a few years ago by the author of

(a) Memoirs of Count Forbin.

this work. The rams, who were only two, divided the flock between them. The two parcels could not avoid pasturing in common, because they were shut up in one inclosure: but they had different spots for rest during night; nor was it known, that a sheep ever deserted its party, or even changed its resting-place. In the two species last mentioned, I find not that there is any notion of punishment; nor does it appear to be necessary: the leader pretends to nothing but precedence, which is never disputed. I blush to present these imperfect hints, the fruit of casual observation, not of intentional enquiry: but I am glad to blow the trumpet, in order to raise curiosity in others: if the subject be prosecuted by men of taste and enquiry, many final causes, I am persuaded, will be discovered, tending more and more to display the wisdom and goodness of Providence. But what I have chiefly in view at present is, to observe, that government among brute animals, however simple, appears to be perfect in its kind; and adapted with great propriety to their nature. Factions in the state are unknown: no enmity between individuals, no treachery, no deceit, nor any other of those vices that infest the human race. In a word, they appear to be perfectly well fitted for that kind of society to which they are prompted by their nature, and for being happy in it.

Storing up the foregoing observations till there be occasion for them, we proceed to the social nature of man. That men are endowed with an appetite for society, will be vouched by the concurring testimony of all men, each vouching for himself. There is accordingly no instance of people living in a solitary state, where the appetite is not obstructed by some potent obstacle. The inhabitants of that part of New Holland which Dampier saw, live in society, tho' less advanced above brutes than any other known savages; and so intimate is their society, that they gather their food, and eat, in common. The inhabitants of the Canary islands

lived

lived in the same manner, when first seen by Europeans, which was in the fourteenth century; and the savages mentioned by Condamine, drawn by a Jesuit from the woods to settle on the banks of the Oroonoko, must originally have been united in some kind of society, as they had a common language. In a word, that man hath an appetite for food, is not more certain, than that he hath an appetite for society. And here I have occasion to apply one of the observations made above. Abstracting altogether from the pleasure we have in society, similar to what we have in eating; evident it is, that to no animal is society more necessary than to man, whether for food or for defence. In society, he is chief of the terrestrial creation; in a solitary state, the most helpless and forlorn. Thus the first question suggested above, viz. To what end was a social appetite bestow'd on man, has received an answer, which I flatter myself will give satisfaction.

The next question is, Whether the appetite be limited, as among other animals, to a society of moderate extent; or whether it prompt an association with the whole species. That the appetite is limited, will be evident from history. Men, as far back as they can be traced, have been divided into small tribes or societies. Most of these, it is true, have in later times been united into large states: such revolutions however have been brought about, not by an appetite for a more extensive society, but by conquest, or by the junction of small tribes for defence against the more powerful. A society may indeed be too small for complete gratification of the appetite; and the appetite thus cramped welcomes every person into the society till it have sufficient scope: the Romans, a diminutive tribe originally, were fond to associate even with their enemies after a victory. But, on the other hand, a society may be too large for complete gratification. An extensive empire is an object too bulky: national affection is too much diffused; and the mind is not at ease till it find a more contracted society,

society, corresponding to the moderation of its appetite. Hence the numerous orders, associations, fraternities, and divisions, that spring up in every great state. The ever-during Blues and Greens in the Roman empire, and Guelphs and Gibelines in Italy, could not have long subsisted after the cause of their enmity was at an end, but for a tendency in the members of a great state to contract their social connections *. Initiations among the ancients were probably owing to the same cause; as also associations of artisans among the moderns, pretending mystery and secrecy, and excluding all strangers. Of such associations or brotherhoods, the free masons excepted, there is scarce now a vestige remaining.

We find now, after an accurate scrutiny, that the social appetite in man comprehends not the whole species, but a part only; and commonly a small part, precisely as in other animals. Here another final cause starts up, no less remarkable than that explain'd above. An appetite to associate with the whole species, would form states so unwieldy by numbers, as to be incapable of any government. Our appetite is wisely confined within such limits as to form states of moderate extent, which of all are the best fitted for good government: and we shall see afterward, that they are also the best fitted for improving the human powers, and for enervating every manly virtue. Hence an instructive lesson, That a great empire is ill suited to human nature, and that a great conqueror is in more respects than one an enemy to mankind.

The limiting our social appetite within moderate bounds, suggests another final cause. An appetite to associate with the whole species, would collect into one society all who are not separated from each other by wide seas and inaccessible mountains; and consequently

* The never-ceasing factions in Britain proceed, not from a society too much extended, but from love of power and of wealth; to restrain which there is no sufficient authority in a free government.

would distribute mankind into a very few societies, consisting of such multitudes as to reduce national affection to a mere shadow. Nature hath wisely limited the appetite in proportion to our mental capacity. Our relations, our friends, and our other connections, open an extensive field for the exercise of affection: nay, our country in general, if not too extensive, would alone be sufficient to engross our whole affection. But that beautiful speculation falls more properly under the principles of morality; and there it shall not be overlooked.

What comes next in order, is to examine how we stand affected to those who are not of our tribe or society. I pave the way to this examination, by taking up man naked at his entrance into life. An infant at first has no feeling but bodily pain; and it is familiarized with its nurse, its parents, and perhaps with others, before it is susceptible of any passion. All weak animals are endowed with a principle of fear, which prompts them to shun danger; and fear, the first passion discovered in an infant, is raised by every new face: the infant shrinks and hides itself in the bosom of its nurse * (a). Thus every stranger is an object of fear to an infant; and consequently of aversion, which is generated by fear. Fear lessens gradually as our circle of acquaintance enlarges, especially in those who rely on bodily strength. Nothing tends more effectually to dissipate fear, than consciousness of security in the social state: in solitude, no animal is more timid than man; in society, none more bold. But remark, that aversion may subsist after fear is gone: it is propagated from parents to their children through an endless succession; and is infectious like a disease. Thus enmity is kept up between tribes, without any particular

* In this respect the human race differs widely from that of dogs: a puppy, the first time it sees a man, runs to him, licks his hand, and plays about his feet.

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 441. edit. 5.

cause. A neighbouring tribe, constantly in our sight, and capable to hurt us, is the object of our strongest aversion: it lessens in proportion to distance; and terminates in absolute indifference with respect to very distant tribes. Upon the whole, it appears, that the nature of man with respect to those of his own kind is resolvable into the following particulars. First, Affection for our private connections, and for our country in general. Second, Aversion to neighbours who are strangers to us, and to neighbouring tribes in general. Third, Indifference with respect to all others.

As I neither hope nor wish, that the nature of man, as above delineated, be taken upon my authority, I propose to verify it by clear and substantial facts. But to avoid the multiplying instances unnecessarily, I shall confine myself to such as concern the aversion that neighbouring tribes have to each other; taking it for granted, that private affection, and love to our country, are what no person doubts of. I begin with examples of rude nations, where nature is left to itself, without culture. The inhabitants of Greenland, good-natured and inoffensive, have not even words for expressing anger or envy: stealing among themselves is abhorred; and a young woman guilty of that crime, has no chance for a husband. At the same time, they are faithless and cruel to those who come among them: they consider the rest of mankind as a different race, with whom they reject all society. The morality of the inhabitants of New Zealand is not more refined. Writers differ about the inhabitants of the Marian or Ladrone islands; Magellan, and other voyagers, say, that they are addicted to thieving; and their testimony occasioned these islands to be called *Ladrones*. Pere le Gobien, on the contrary, says, that, far from being addicted to thieving, they leave every thing open, having no distrust one of another. These accounts differ in appearance, not in reality. Magellan was a stranger; and he talks of stealing from

from him and from his companions. Father Gobien lived long among them, and talks of their fidelity to each other. Plan Carpin, who visited Tartary in the year 1246, observes of the Tartars, that, tho' full of veracity to their neighbours, they thought themselves not bound to speak truth to strangers. The Greeks anciently were held to be pirates: but not properly; for they committed depredations upon strangers only. Cæsar, speaking of the Germans (a), says, "Latrocinia nullam habent infamiam quæ extra fines cujusque civitatis fiunt *." This was precisely the case of our highlanders, till they were brought under due subjection after the rebellion 1745. Bougainville observes, that the inhabitants of Otaheite, named by the English *King George's island*, made no difficulty of stealing from his people; and yet never steal among themselves, having neither locks nor bars in their houses. The people of Benin in Negroland are good-natured, gentle, and civilized; and so generous, that if they receive a present, they are not at ease till they return it double. They have unbounded confidence in their own people; but are jealous of strangers, tho' they politely hide their jealousy. Russian peasants think it a greater sin to eat meat in Lent, than to murder one of another country. Among the Koriacs, bordering on Kamlskatka, murder within the tribe is severely punished; but to murder a stranger is not minded. While Rome continued a small state, neighbour and enemy were expressed by the same word (b). In England of old, a foreigner was not admitted to be a witness. Hence it is, that in ancient history, we read of wars without intermission among small

* "They hold it not infamous to rob without the bounds of their canton."

(a) Lib. 6. c. 23. de bello Gallico.

(b) Hostis.

states in close neighbourhood. It was so in Greece; it was so in Italy during the infancy of the Roman republic; it was so in Gaul, when Cæsar commenced hostilities against that country (a); and it was so all the world over. Many islands in the South sea, and in other remote parts, have been discovered by Europeans; who commonly found the natives with arms in their hands, resolute to prevent the strangers from landing. Orellana, lieutenant to Gonzales Pizarro, was the first European who sailed down the river Amazon to the sea. In his passage, he was continually assaulted with arrows from the banks of the river; and some even ventured to attack him in their canoes.

Nor does such aversion wear away even among polished people. An ingenious writer (b) remarks, that almost every nation hate their neighbours, without knowing why. I once heard a Frenchman swear, says that writer, that he hated the English, *parce qu'ils versent du beurre fondu sur leur veau roti* *. The populace of Portugal have to this day an uncommon aversion to strangers: even those of Lisbon, tho' a trading town frequented by many different nations, must not be excepted. Travellers report, that the people of the duchy of Milan, remarkable for good-nature, are the only Italians who are not hated by their neighbours. The Piedmontese and Genoese have an aversion to each other, and agree only in their antipathy to the Tuscans. The Tuscans dislike the Venetians; and the Romans abound not with good-will to the Tuscans, Venetians, or Neapolitans. Very different is the case with respect to distant nations: instead of being objects of aversion,

* "Because they pour melted butter upon their roast veal."

(a) Lib. 6. c. 15. de bello Gallico.

(b) Baretti.

their manners, customs, and singularities, amuse us greatly *.

Infants differ from each other in aversion to strangers; some being extremely shy, others less so; and the like difference is observable in whole tribes. The people of Milan cannot have any aversion to their neighbours, when they are such favourites of all around them. The inhabitants of some South-sea islands, mentioned above (a), appear to have little or no aversion to strangers. But that is a rare instance, and has scarce a parallel in any other part of the globe. It holds also true, that nations the most remarkable for patriotism, are equally remarkable for aversion to strangers. The Jews, the Greeks, the Romans, were equally remarkable for both. Patriotism, a vigorous principle among the English, makes them extremely averse to naturalize foreigners. The inhabitants of New Zealand, both men and women, appear to be of a mild and gentle disposition; they treat one another with affection; but are implacable to their enemies, and never give quarter. It is even customary among them to eat the flesh of their enemies.

To a person of humanity, the scene here exhibited is far from being agreeable. Man, it may be thought, is of all animals the most barbarous; for even animals of prey are innoxious with respect to their own kind †. Aversion to strangers makes a branch of

* Voltaire, (Universal History, ch. 40.), observing, rightly, that jealousy among petty princes is productive of more crimes than among great monarchs, gives a very unsatisfactory reason, viz. That having little force, they must employ fraud, poison, and other secret crimes; not adverting, that power may be equally distributed among small princes as well as among great. It is antipathy that instigates such crimes, which is always the most violent among the nearest neighbours.

(a) Book 1. sketch 1.

† “ Denique cætera animantia in suo genere probe degunt : congregari videmus,

of our nature: it exists among individuals in private life; it flames high between neighbouring tribes; and is visible even in infancy. Can such perversity of disposition promote any good end? This question, which pierces deep into human nature, is reserved to close the present sketch.

From the foregoing deduction, universal benevolence, inculcated by several writers as a moral duty, is discovered to be erroneous. Our appetite for society is limited, and our duty must be limited in proportion. But of this more directly when the principles of morality are taken under consideration.

We are taught by the great Newton, that attraction and repulsion in matter, are, by alteration of circumstances, converted one into the other. This holds also in affection and aversion, which may be termed, not improperly, *mental attraction* and *repulsion*. Two nations, originally strangers to each other, may, by commerce, or other favourable circumstance, become so well acquainted, as to change from aversion to affection. The opposite manners of a capital and of a country-town, afford a good illustration. In the latter, people, occupied with their domestic concerns, are in a manner strangers to each other: a degree of aversion prevails, which gives birth to envy and detraction. In the former, a court, with public amusements, promote general acquaintance: repulsion yields to attraction, and people become fond to associate with

“ et stare contra dissimilia: leonum feritas inter se non dimicat: serpentum morsus non petit serpentes; ne maris quidem belluæ ac pisces, nisi in diversa genera, sæviunt. At, Hercule, homini plurima ex homine sunt mala.” *Pliny, lib. 7. Proæmium.* [In English thus: “For other animals live at peace with those of their species. They gather themselves in troops, and unite against the common enemy. The ferocious lion fights not against his species: the poisonous serpent is harmless to his kind: the monsters of the sea prey but on those fishes that differ from them in nature: man alone of animals is foe to man!”]

their

their equals. The union of two tribes into one, is another circumstance that converts repulsion into attraction. Such conversion, however, is far from being instantaneous; witness the different small states of Spain, which were not united in affection for many years after they were united under one monarch; and this was also the case of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland. In some circumstances the conversion is instantaneous; as where a stranger becomes an object of pity or of gratitude. Many low persons in Britain contributed cheerfully for maintaining some French seamen, made prisoners at the commencement of the late war. It is no less instantaneous, when strangers, relying on our humanity, trust themselves in our hands. Among the ancients, it was hospitality to strangers only that produced mutual affection and gratitude: Glaucus and Diomedes were of different countries. Hospitality to strangers, is a pregnant symptom of improving manners. Cæsar, speaking of the Germans (a), says, “*Hospites violare, fas non putant: qui, quæque de causa, ad eos venerunt, ab injuria prohibent, sanctosque habent; his omnium domus patent, victusque communicatur* *.” The ancient Spaniards were fond of war, and cruel to their enemies; but in peace, they passed their time in singing and dancing, and were remarkably hospitable to the strangers who came among them. It shews great refinement in the Celts, that the killing a stranger was capital, when the killing a citizen was banishment only (b). The

“ They hold it sacrilege to injure a stranger. They protect from outrage, and venerate those who come among them: their houses are open to them, and they are welcome to their tables.”

(a) Lib. 6, c. 23. de bello Gallico.

(b) Nicolaus Damascenus.

Swedes and Goths were eminently hospitable to strangers; as indeed were all the northern nations of Europe (a). The negroes of Fouli, are celebrated by travellers as extremely kind to strangers. The native Brazilians are singularly hospitable. A stranger no sooner arrives among them than he is surrounded with women, who wash his feet, and set before him to eat the best things they have. If a stranger have occasion to go more than once to the same village, the person whose guest he was takes it much amiss if he think of changing his lodging.

There are causes that for a time suspend enmity between neighbouring states. The small states of Greece, among whom war had no end, frequently smothered their enmity to join against the formidable monarch of Persia. There are also causes that suspend for a time all animosity between factions in the same state. The endless factions in Britain about power and pre-eminence, not a little disagreeable during peace, are laid asleep during a foreign war.

On the other hand, attraction is converted into repulsion by various causes. One is, the splitting a great monarchy into many small states; of which the Assyrian, the Persian, the Roman, and the Saracen empires, are instances. The *amor patriæ*, faint in an extensive monarchy, readily yields to aversion, operating between two neighbouring states, less extensive. This is observable between neighbouring colonies, even of the same nation: the English colonies in North America, tho' they retain some affection for their mother-country, have contracted an aversion to each other. And happy for them is such aversion, if it prevent their uniting in order to acquire independency: wars without end would be the inevitable consequence, as among small states in close neighbourhood.

(d) Saxo Grammaticus. Crantz.

Hitherto the road has been smooth, without obstruction. But we have not yet finished our journey; and the remaining question, viz. How far are men fitted by their nature for being useful members of civil society, and for being happy in it, will, I suspect, lead into a road neither smooth nor free from obstruction. The social branch of human nature would be woefully imperfect, if man had an appetite for society without being fitted for that state: the appetite, instead of tending to a good end, would be his bane. And yet, whether he be or be not fitted for society, seems doubtful. In examining the conduct of man, he is to us a disgustful object in his aversion to those of a different tribe; and I violently suspect, that in his behaviour even to those of his own tribe, he will scarce be found an agreeable object. That he is fitted by nature for being an useful member of a social state, and for being happy in it, appears from facts many and various. I instance first, several corresponding principles or propensities, that cannot be exerted nor gratified but in society, viz. the propensities of veracity, and of relying on human testimony; appetite for knowledge, and desire to communicate knowledge; anxiety in distress to be pitied, and sympathy with the distressed; appetite for praise, and inclination to praise the deserving *. Such corresponding propensities, not only qualify men for the social state as far as their influence reaches, but attract them sweetly into society for the sake of gratification, and make them happy in it. But this is not all, nor indeed the greater part. Do not benevolence, compassion, magnanimity, heroism, and the whole train of social affections, demonstrate our fitness for society, and our happiness in it? And justice, above all other virtues, promotes peace and con-

* Appetite for praise is inherent even in savages: witness those of North America, who upon that account are fond of dress. I mean the men; for the women are such miserable slaves as to have no spirit for ornament.

cord in that state. Nor ought the faculty of speech to be overlooked, which in an eminent degree qualifies man for society, and is a plentiful source of enjoyment in it.

On the other hand, there are facts, not fewer in number, nor less various, tending to evince, that man is ill fitted for society, and that there is little happiness for him in it. What can be more averse to concord in society than dissocial passions? and yet these prevail among men. Are not envy, malice, revenge, treachery, deceit, avarice, ambition, &c. &c. noxious weeds that poison society? We meet every where persons bent on the destruction of others, evincing that man has no enemies more formidable than of his own kind, and of his own tribe. Are not discord and feuds the chief articles in the history of every state, factions violently bent against each other, and frequently breaking out into civil wars? Appian's history of the civil wars of Rome exhibits a horrid scene of massacres, proscriptions, and forfeitures; the leaders sacrificing their firmest friends, for liberty to suck the blood of their enemies; as if to shed human blood were the ruling passion of man. But the Romans were far from being singular: the polite Greeks, commonly so characterized, were still more brutal and bloody. The following passage is copied from a celebrated author (a). "Not to mention Dionysius the elder, who is computed to have butchered in cold blood above 10,000 of his fellow-citizens; nor Agathocles, Nabis, and others, still more bloody than he; the transactions even in free governments were extremely violent and destructive. At Athens, the thirty tyrants, and the nobles, in a twelvemonth, murdered without trial about 1200 of the people, and banished above the half of the citizens that remained. In Argos, near the same time, the people killed 1200 of the nobles, and afterward their own de-

(a) Essay of the populousness of ancient nations, by David Hume, Esq;

“ magogues, because they had refused to carry their prosecutions
“ farther. The people also in Corcyra killed 1500 of the nobles,
“ and banished 1000. These numbers will appear the more sur-
“ prising, if we consider the extreme smallness of those states.
“ But all ancient history is full of such instances.” Upon a re-
volution in the Saracen empire ann. 750, where the Ommiyan fa-
mily was expelled by that of the Abbassians, Abdolah, chief of the
latter, published an act of oblivion to the former, on condition
of their taking an oath of allegiance to him. The Ommiyans,
embracing the condition, were in appearance graciously received.
But in preparing to take the oath, they were knocked down every
one of them by the Emperor’s guards. And fully to glut the mon-
ster’s cruelty, these princes, still alive, were laid close together,
and covered with boards and carpets; upon which Abdolah feast-
ed his officers, “ in order,” said he, “ that we may be exhila-
“ rated with the dying groans of the Ommiyans.” During the
vigour of the feudal system, when every man was a soldier who
aspired to be a gentleman, justice was no defence against power, nor
humanity against bloody resentment. Stormy passions raged every
where with unrelenting fury; every place a chaos of confusion
and distress. No man was secure but in his castle; and to venture
abroad unless well armed, and well attended, would have been an
act of high temerity. So little intercourse was there among the
French in the tenth century, that an abbot of Clugni, invited by
the Count of Paris to bring some monks to the abbey of St Maur,
near that city, excused himself for declining a journey through a
strange and unknown country. In the history of Scotland, du-
ring the minority of James II. we find nothing but barbarous and
cruel manners, depredations, burning of houses, bloodshed and
massacre without end. Pitcottie says, that oppression, theft, fa-
crilege, ravishing of women, were but a *dalliance*. How similar to
beasts of prey set loose against each other in the Roman circus!

Men are prone to split into parties for the very slightest causes ; and when a cause is wanting, parties are often formed upon words merely. Whig and Tory subsisted long in England, upon no better foundation. The Tories professed passive obedience ; but declared, that they would not be slaves. The Whigs professed resistance ; but declared it unlawful to resist, unless to prevent the being made slaves. Had these parties been disposed to unite, they soon would have discovered, that they differed in words only. The same observation is applicable to many religious disputes. One sect maintains, that we are saved by faith alone ; another, that good works are necessary. The difference lies merely in words. The first acknowledges, that if a man commit sin, he cannot have faith ; and consequently under faith are comprehended good works. The other acknowledges, that good works imply good intention, or, in other words, faith ; and consequently, under good works faith is comprehended (a). The following instance, solemnly ludicrous, is of parties formed merely from an inclination to differ, without any cause real or verbal. No people were less interested in the late war between the Queen of Hungary and the King of Prussia than the citizens of Ravenna. They however split into two parties, which renounced all society with each other. After the battle of Rosbach, a leading partyman withdrew for a month, without once showing his face in public. But our catalogue is not yet complete. Differences concerning civil matters make no figure compared with what concern religion. It is lamentable to observe, that religious sects resemble neighbouring states ; the nearer they are to one another, the greater is their rancour and animosity. But as all histories are full of the cruelty and desolation occasioned by differences in religious tenets, I cannot bear to dwell longer upon such horrid scenes.

(a) See Knox's Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, p. 13.

What conclusion are we to draw from the foregoing facts, so inconsistent in appearance with each other? I am utterly at a loss to reconcile them, otherwise than by holding man to be a compound of principles and passions, some social, some dissocial. Opposite principles or passions cannot at the same instant be exerted upon the same object (a); but they may be exerted at the same instant upon different objects, and at different times upon the same object. This observation serves indeed to explain a seeming inconsistency in our nature, as being at one time highly social, and at another time no less dissocial: but it affords not a solution to the question, Whether, upon the whole, men be fitted for society, and for being happy in it. In order to a solution, we find it necessary to take a second view of the natural history of man.

In a nascent society, where men hunt and fish in common, where there is plenty of game, and where the sense of property is faint, mutual affection prevails, because there is no cause of discord; and dissocial passions find sufficient vent against neighbouring tribes. Such is the condition of the North-American savages, who continue hunters and fishers to this day; and such is the condition of all brute animals that live in society, as mentioned above. The island Otaheite is divided into many small cantons, having each a chief of its own. These cantons never make war on each other, tho' they are frequently at war with the inhabitants of neighbouring islands. The inhabitants of the new Philippine islands, if Father Gobien be credited, are better fitted for society than any other known nation. Sweetness of temper, and love to do good, form their character. They never commit acts of violence: war they have no notion of; and it is a proverb among them, That a man never puts a man to death. Plato places the seat of justice and of happiness among the first men; and a-

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 143. edit. 5.

among them existed the golden age, if it ever did exist. But when a nation, becoming populous, begins with rearing flocks and herds, proceeds to appropriate land, and is not satisfied without matters of luxury over and above; selfishness and pride gain ground, and become ruling and unruly passions. Causes of discord multiply, vent is given to avarice and resentment; and among a people not yet perfectly submissive to government, dissocial passions rage, and threaten a total dissolution of society: nothing indeed suspends the impending blow, but the unwearied, tho' silent, operation of the social appetite. Such was the condition of the Greeks at a certain period of their progress, as mentioned above; and such was the condition of Europe, and of France in particular, during the anarchy of the feudal system, when all was discord, blood, and rapine. In general, where-ever avarice and disorderly passions bear rule, I boldly pronounce, that men are ill qualified for society.

Providence extracts order out of confusion. Men, in a society so uncomfortable, are taught by dire experience, that they must either renounce society, or qualify themselves for it — the choice is easy, but how difficult the practice! After infinite struggles, appetite for society prevailed; and time, that universal conqueror, perfected men in the art of subduing their passions, or of dissembling them. Finding now no enjoyment but in society, we are solicitous about the good-will of others; and we adhere to justice and good manners: disorderly passions are suppressed, kindly affections encouraged, and men become less unfit for society than formerly.

But is the progress of men toward the perfection of society to stop here? are lust of power and of property to continue for ever leading principles? are envy, revenge, treachery, deceit, never to have an end? "How devoutly to be wished, (it will be said), that all men, "were upright and honest; and that all of the same nation were
" united

"united like a single family in concord and mutual affection! Here indeed would be perpetual sunshine, a golden age, a state approaching to that of good men made perfect in heavenly mansions." Beware of indulging such pleasing dreams. The system of Providence differs widely from our wishes; and shall ignorant man venture to arraign Providence? Are we qualified to judge of the whole, when but so small a part is visible? It is our duty to believe, that were the whole visible, it would appear beautiful. We are not however reduced to an act of pure faith: a glimmering light, breaking in, makes it at least doubtful, whether upon the whole it be not really better for us to be as we are. Let us follow that glimmering light to see where it will lead us.

I begin with observing, that tho' in our present condition we suffer much distress from selfish and dissocial passions, yet custom renders our distresses familiar, and hardens us not only to bear but to brave them. Strict adherence to the rules of justice would indeed secure our persons and our property: robbery and murder would vanish, and locks and guns be heard of no more. So far excellent, were no new evils to come in their place: but the void must be filled, and mental distresses would break in of various kinds, such particularly as proceed from refined delicacy and nice sensibility of honour, little regarded while we are exposed to dangers more alarming. And whether the change would be much to our advantage, appears doubtful: pain as well as pleasure is measured by comparison; and the slightest pain, such for example as arises from a transgression of civility or good-breeding, will overwhelm a person who has never felt any more severe. At any rate, natural evils will remain; and that extreme delicacy and softness of temper which are produced by eternal peace and concord, would render such evils unsupportable: the slight inconveniencies of a rough road, bad weather, or homely fare, would become serious evils, and afflict the traveller past enduring. The

French,

French, among whom society has obtained a more refined polish than in any other nation, have become so soft and delicate as to lose all fortitude in distress. They cannot bear even a representation of severe affliction in a tragedy: an English audience would fall asleep at the slight distresses that make a deep impression in the French theatre.

But now supposing, that a scrupulous adherence to the rules of morality would be a real improvement in society; yet to me it appears evident, that men as individuals would suffer more by that improvement, than they would gain as members of society. In order to preserve the rules of justice untainted, and to maintain perfect concord and affection among men, all dissocial and selfish passions must necessarily be extirpated, or brought under absolute subjection. Attend to the consequences: they deserve our most sober attention. Agitation is requisite to the mind as well as to the body: a man engaged in a brisk pursuit, whether of business or of pleasure, is in his element, and in high spirits: but when no object is in view to be attained or to be avoided, his spirits flag, and he sinks into languor and despondence. To prevent a condition so baneful to man, he is provided with many passions, which impel him to action without intermission, and invigorate both mind and body. But upon the present supposition, scarce any motive to action would remain; and man, reduced to a lethargic state, would rival no being above an oyster or a sensitive plant.

Nor ought it to be overlooked, that an uniform life of peace, tranquillity, and security, would not be long relished. Constant repetition of the same pleasures, would render even a golden age tasteless, like an Italian sky during a long summer. Nature has for wise purposes impressed upon us a taste for variety (a); and without it, life would be altogether insipid. Paraguai, when govern-

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 320. edit. 5.

ed by the Jesuits, affords a fine illustration. It was divided into parishes, in each of which a Jesuit presided as king, priest, and prophet. The natives were not suffered to have any property, but laboured incessantly for their daily bread, which was delivered to them out of a public magazine. The men were employ'd in agriculture, the women in spinning; and certain precise hours were allotted for labour, for food, for prayer, and for sleep*. They sunk into such a listless state of mind, as to have no regret at dying when attacked by disease or by old age. Such was their indifference about what might befall them, that tho' they adored the Jesuits, yet they made no opposition, when the fathers were, ann. 1767, attacked by the Spaniards, and their famous republic demolished. The monkish life is contradictory to the nature of man: the languor of that state is what in all probability tempts many a monk and nun, to find occupation even at the expence of virtue. The life of the Maltese knights is far from being agreeable, now that their knight-errantry against the Turks has subsided. While they reside in the island, a strict uniformity in their manner of living is horridly irksome. Absence is their only relief, when they can obtain permission. There will not at last remain a knight in the island, except such as by office are tied to attendance.

I proceed to another consideration. Familiarity with danger is necessary to eradicate our natural timidity; and so deeply rooted is that principle, that familiarity with danger of one sort, does not harden us with respect to any other sort. A foldier, bold as a lion in the field, is

* Beside Paraguai tea, for which there is great demand in Peru, cotton, tobacco, and sugar-canes, were cultivated in Paraguai, and the product was stored up in magazines. No Indian durst keep in his house so much as an ounce of any of these commodities, under pain of receiving twelve lashes in honour of the twelve apostles, beside fasting three days in the house of correction. The fathers seldom inflicted a capital punishment, because it deprived them of a profitable slave.

faint-hearted at sea, like a child; and a seaman, who braves the winds and waves, trembles when mounted on a horse of spirit. Courage does not superabound at present, even in the midst of dangers and unforeseen accidents: sedentary manufacturers, who seldom are in the way of harm, are remarkably pusillanimous. What would men be in the supposed condition of universal peace, concord, and security? they would rival a hare or a mouse in timidity. Farewell, upon that supposition, to courage, magnanimity, heroism, and to every passion that ennobles human nature! There may perhaps be men, who, hugging themselves in being secure against harm, would not be altogether averse to such degeneracy. But if such men there be, I pray them only to reflect, that in the progress from infancy to maturity, all nations do not ripen equally. One nation may have arrived at the supposed perfection of society, before another has advanced much beyond the savage state. What security hath the former against the latter? Precisely the same that timid sheep have against hungry wolves.

I shall finish with one other effect of the supposed perfection of society, more degrading, if possible, than any mentioned. Exercise, as observed above, is not less essential to the mind than to the body. The reasoning faculty, for example, without constant and varied exercise, will remain weak and undistinguishing to the end of life. By what means doth a man acquire prudence and foresight, but by practice? It is precisely here as in the body: deprive a child of motion, and it will never acquire any strength of limbs. The many difficulties that men encounter, and their various objects of pursuit, rouse the understanding, and set the reasoning faculty at work for means to accomplish desire. The mind, by continual exercise, ripens to its perfection; and, by the same means, is preserved in vigour. It would have no such exercise in the supposed perfection of society; where there would be little to be desired, and less to be dreaded: our mental faculties

would

would for ever lie dormant; and we should remain for ever ignorant that we have such faculties. The people of Paragual are described as mere children in understanding. What wonder, considering their condition under Jesuit government, without ambition, without property, without fear of want, and without desires? The wants of those who inhabit the torrid zone are easily supplied: they need no cloathing, scarce any habitation; and fruits, which ripen there to perfection, give them food without labouring for it. Need we any other cause for their inferiority of understanding, compared with the inhabitants of other climates, where the mind, as well as body, are constantly at work for procuring necessities * ?

That

* The blessings of ease and inaction are most poetically display'd in the following description. " O felix Lapo, qui in ultimo angulo mundi sic bene lates, contentus et innocens. Tu nec times annonæ charitatem, nec Martis proelia, quæ ad tuas bras pervenire nequeunt, sed florentissimas Europæ provincias et urbés, unico momento, sæpe dejiciunt et delect. Tu dormis hic sub tua pelle, ab omnibus curis, contentionibus, rixis, liber, ignorans quid sit invidia. Tu nulla nosti discrimina, nisi tonantis Jovis fulmina. Tu ducis innocentissimos tuos annos ultra centenarium numerum, cum facili senectute et summa sanitate. Te latent myriades morborum nobis Europæis communes. Tu vivis in sylvis, avis instar, nec sementem facis, nec metis; tamen alit te Deus optimus optime." *Linnaeus, Flora Lapponica.* — [In English thus: " O happy Laplander, who, on the utmost verge of habitable earth, thus livest obscure in rest, content, and innocence. Thou fearest not the scanty crop, nor ravages of war; and those calamities which waste whole provinces and towns, can ne'er attain thy peaceful shores. Wrapt in thy covering of fur, thou canst securely sleep; a stranger to each tumultuous care; unenvying and unenvied. Thou fearest no danger, but from the thunder of heaven. Thy harmless days slide on in innocence, beyond the period of a century. Thy health is firm; and thy declining age is tranquil. Millions of diseases which ravage the rest of the world, have never reached thy happy climate. Thou livest as the birds of the wood, thou carest not to sow nor reap, for bounteous Providence has supplied thee in all thy wants."

That curious writer Mandevil, who is always entertaining, if he does not always instruct, exults in maintaining a proposition seemingly paradoxical, That private vices are public benefits. He proves indeed, most triumphantly, that theft produced locks and bars, and that war produced swords and guns. But what would have been his triumph, had he discovered, that selfish and dissocial vices promote the most elevated virtues, and that if such vices were eradicated, man would be a groveling and contemptible being?

How rashly do men judge of the conduct of Providence! So flattering to the imagination is a golden age, a life of perpetual sunshine, as to have been a favourite topic among poets, ancient and modern. Impressed with the felicity of such a state, it is not easy to be satisfied with our condition in this life. Such a jumble of good and ill, malice mixed with benevolence, friendship alloy'd with fraud, peace with alarms of war, and frequent bloody wars,—can we avoid concluding, that in this unhappy world chance prevails more than wisdom? What better cause can freethinkers wish for declaiming against Providence, while men better disposed, sigh inwardly, and must be silent? But

behold
—So eloquent a panegyrist upon the Lapland life, would make a capital figure upon an oyster. No creature is freer from want, no creature freer from war, and probably no creature is freer from fear; which, alas! is not the case of the Laplander.

* L'homme qui ne peut que par le nombre, qui n'est fort que par sa réunion, qui n'est heureux que par la paix, a la fureur de s'armer pour son malheur et de combattre pour sa ruine. Excité par l'insatiable avidité, aveuglé par l'ambition encore plus insatiable, il renonce aux sentiments d'humanité, cherche à s'entre-détruire, se détruit en effet; et après ces jours de sang et de carnage, lorsque la fumée de la gloire s'est dissipée, il voit d'un oeil triste la terre dévastée, les arts ensevelies,

behold the blindness of men with respect to the dispensations of Providence! A golden age would to man be more poisonous than

sevelies, les nations dispersées, les peuples affaiblis, son propre bonheur ruiné, et sa puissance réelle anéantie.

“Grand Dieu! dont la seule présence soutient la nature et maintient l’harmonie des loix de l’univers; Vous, qui du trône immobile de l’empire, voyez

“rouler sous vos pieds toutes les sphères célestes sans choc et sans confusion; qui

“du sein du repos, reproduisez à chaque instant leurs mouvemens immenses, et

“seul réglez dans une paix profonde ce nombre infini de ciens et de mondes;

“rendez, rendez enfin le calme à la terre agitée! Qu’elle soit dans le silence!

“Qu’à votre voix la discorde et la guerre cessent de faire retenter leurs clameurs

“orgueilleuses! Dieu de bonté, auteur de tous les êtres, vos regards paternels

“embrassent tous les objets de la création: mais l’homme est votre être de choix;

“vous avez éclairé son ame d’une rayon de votre lumière immortelle; comblez

“vos bienfaits en pénétrant son cœur d’un trait de votre amour: ce sentiment di-

“vin se répandant par-tout, réunira les natures ennemies; l’homme ne craindra

“plus l’aspect de l’homme, le fer homicide n’armera plus sa main; le feu dévo-

“rant de la guerre ne fera plus tarir la source des générations; l’espece humaine

“maintenant affaiblie, mutilée, moissonnée dans sa fleur, germara de nouveau et

“se multipliera sans nombre; la nature accablée sous le poids de fléaux, stérile,

“abandonnée, reprendra bientôt avec une nouvelle vie son ancienne fécondité; et

“nous, Dieu Bienfaiteur, nous la seconderons, nous la cultiverons, nous l’obser-

“verons sans cesse pour vous offrir à chaque instant un nouveau tribut de recon-

“naissance et d’admiration.” *Buffon Histoire Naturelle, vol. 9. 8vo. edit.*

[In English thus: “Man who is powerful only by numbers, whose strength

consists in the union of forces, and whose happiness is to be found alone in a state

of peace, has yet the madness to take arms for his own misery, and fight to the

ruin of his species. Urged on by insatiable avarice, and blinded by ambition, still

more insatiable, he banishes from his breast every sentiment of humanity, and, ea-

ger for the destruction of his fellow-creatures, in effect destroys himself. When the

days of blood and carnage are past, when the vapour of glory is dissipated, he looks

around with a sorrowful eye upon the desolated earth, he sees the arts extinct,

the nations dispersed, and population dead: his happiness is ruined, and his

power is reduced to nothing.

“Great God! whose sole presence sustains the creative power, and rules the

than Pandora's box; a gift, sweet in the mouth, but bitter, bitter, in the stomach. Let us then forbear repining; for the subject before us must afford conviction, if any thing can, that our best course is to submit humbly to whatever befalls, and to rest satisfied, that the world is governed by wisdom, not by chance. What can be expected of barbarians, but utter ignorance of Providence, and of divine government? But as men ripen in the knowledge of causes and effects, the benevolence as well as wisdom of a superintending Being become more and more apparent. How pleasant is that observation! Beautiful final causes without

" harmony of nature's laws! who from thy permanent celestial throne beholdest
 " the motion of the nether spheres, all-perfect in their course which knows no
 " change; who broughtest from out the womb of rest by endless reproduction
 " those never-ceasing movements; who rulest in peace the infinity of worlds: E-
 " ternal God! vouchsafe at length to send a portion of that heavenly peace to
 " calm the agitated earth. Let every tumult cease: at thy celestial voice, no more
 " be heard around the proud and clamorous shouts of war and discord. All-
 " bounteous Creator! Author of being! each object of thy works partakes of thy
 " paternal care; but chief of all, thy chosen creature man. Thou hast bestowed
 " on him a ray of thine immortal light: O deign to crown that gift, by penetrating
 " his heart with a portion of thy love. Soon will that heavenly sentiment, perva-
 " ding his nature, reconcile each warring and contradictory principle: man will
 " no longer dread the sight of man: the murdering blade will sleep within its
 " sheath: the fire of war will cease to dry up the springs of generation: the hu-
 " man race, now languishing and withering in the bloom, will bud afresh, and
 " multiply: nature, which now sinks beneath the scourge of misery, sterile and
 " desolated, will soon renew her wasted strength, and regain her first fertility.
 " We, O God of benevolence, we thy creatures will second the blessing. It will
 " be ours to bestow on the earth that culture which best can aid her fruitfulness;
 " and we will pay to thee the most acceptable of sacrifices, in endless gratitude and
 " adoration."

How natural is this prayer; how unnatural the state thus anxiously requested! M. Buffon's devotional fits are fervent: pity it is, that they are not better directed.

number

number have been discovered in the material as well as moral world, with respect to many particulars that once appeared dark and gloomy. Many continue to have that appearance: but with respect to these, is it too bold to maintain, that an argument from ignorance, a slender argument at any rate, is altogether insufficient in judging of divine government? How salutary is it for man, and how comfortable, to rest on the faith, that whatever is, is the best!

SKETCH

How natural in this paper, how universal the state thus anxiously requested! M. Bardon's devotional life are further: pay it is, that they are not better directed.

During the infancy of national societies, government is extremely simple; and no less mild than simple. No individual is by nature inclined to exercise magisterial authority over his fellows; for no individual is born with any mark of pre-eminence to vouch that he has such power. But nature teaches respect for men of age and experience; who accordingly rise the best fit for deliberating and directing the affairs of the community.

S K E T C H I I

General View of GOVERNMENT.

THE progress of government, accurately delineated, would produce a great volume: in this work there is room but for a few hints. What are the means that fit men for society, is explained above; but writers are far from being unanimous about the means that fit them for government. All agree, that submission to our governors is a duty: but they appear to be at a loss upon what foundation to rest that duty; as if it were not evident, that by our nature we are fitted for government as well as for society (a). If justice or veracity be essential to society, submission to government is no less so; and each of these equally is declared by the moral sense to be our duty. But to qualify man for government, the duty of submission alone is not sufficient: diversity of temper and of talents are also necessary; and accordingly it is so ordered by Providence, that there are never wanting in any society men who are qualified to lead, as well as men who are disposed to follow. Where a number of people convene for any purpose, some will naturally assume authority without the formality of election, and the rest will as naturally submit. A regular government, founded on laws, was probably not thought of, till people had frequently suffered by vicious governors.*

(a) Principles of Equity, p. 177, edit. 2.

* At first, when a certain regimen was once approved, it may be that all was permitted

During the infancy of national societies, government is extremely simple; and no less mild than simple. No individual is by nature intitled to exercise magisterial authority over his fellows; for no individual is born with any mark of pre-eminence to vouch that he has such a privilege. But nature teaches respect for men of age and experience; who accordingly take the lead in deliberating and advising, leaving execution to the young and vigorous *. War indeed cannot be carried on without a commander; but originally his authority was limited to actual war; and he returned home a private person, even when crowned with victory. The wants of men were originally so few, and so easily satisfied, as seldom to occasion a controversy among members of the same tribe. And men, finding vent for their dissocial passions against other tribes, were fond to live peaceably at home. Introduction of money made an amazing change. Wealth bestow'd by fortune, or procured by rapine, made an impression on the vulgar: different ranks were recognised: the rich became imperious, and the poor mutinous. Selfishness, prevailing over social affection, stirred up every man against his neighbour; and

permitted to the wisdom and discretion of those who were to rule; till by experience this was found very inconvenient, so as the thing devised for a remedy did increase the fore which it should have cured. They saw, "that to live by one man's will, became the cause of all mens misery." This constrained them to come into laws, wherein all men might see their duty beforehand, and know the penalties of transgressing them. *Hooker's Eccl. Pol. l. 1. § 10.*

* Such as are acquainted with no manners but what are modern, will be puzzled to account for the great veneration paid to old age in early times. Before writing was invented, old men were the repositories of knowledge, which they acquired by experience; and young men had no access to knowledge but from them. At the siege of Troy, Nestor, who had seen three generations, was the chief adviser and director of the Greeks. But as books are now the most patent road to knowledge, to which the old and young have access, it may justly be observed, that by the invention of writing and printing, old men have lost much of their pristine importance.

men,

men, overlooking their natural enemies, gave vent to dissocial passions within their own tribe. It became necessary to strengthen the hands of the sovereign, for repressing passions inflamed by opulence, which tend to a dissolution of society. This slight view fairly accounts for the gradual progress of government from the mildest form to the most despotic. The second part of the progress is more pleasing. Men long enured to the authority of government, acquire a habit of repressing their turbulent passions; and becoming by degrees regular and orderly, they are easily restrained from doing wrong.

During the infancy of a society, punishments must be mild; because government has no sufficient authority over the minds of men to enforce what are severe. But government in time acquires authority; and when its authority is firmly rooted in the minds of the people, punishments more rigorous can be made effectual; and such punishments are necessary among a people not yet well disciplined. When men at last become regular and orderly under a steady administration, punishments become less and less necessary, and the mildest are sufficient (a). The Chinese government is extremely mild, and its punishments are in the same tone. A capital punishment is never inflicted, till the sentence be examined by a sovereign court, and approved by the Emperor. Thus government, after passing through all the intermediate degrees from extreme mildness to extreme severity, returns at last to its original temper of mildness and humanity *.

* An ingenious writer observes, that as our American settlements are now so prosperous, banishment to these settlements is scarce a punishment. He therefore proposes, that criminals be transported to Hudson's bay, or to some other uncultivated country. My doubt is, that in proportion as manners improve, the severity of punishment ought to be mitigated. Perhaps, the transportation to any of our American colonies, tho' less dreadful than formerly, may however be now a sufficient punishment for theft, or other crime of no deeper dye.

(a) Historical Law-tracts, tract 1.

S K E T C H III.

Different FORMS OF GOVERNMENT compared.

OF all governments, democracy is the most turbulent: despotism, which benumbs the mental faculties, and relaxes every spring of action, is in the opposite extreme. Mixed governments, whether monarchical or republican, stand in the middle: they promote activity, but seldom any dangerous excess.

Pure democracy, like that of Athens, Argos, and Carthage, is the very worst form of government, if we make not despotism an exception. The people, in whom resides the sovereign power, are insolent in prosperity, timid in adversity, cruel in anger, blind and prodigal in affection, and incapable of embracing steadily a prudent measure. Thucydides relates (a), that Agis with a gallant army of Spartans surrounded the army of Argos; and, tho' secure of victory, suffered them to retreat, upon solemn assurances from Thrasyllus, the Argian general, of terminating all differences in an amicable treaty. Agis, perhaps justly, was bitterly censured for suffering victory to slip out of his hands: but the Argians, dreaming of victory when the danger was over, brought their general to trial, confiscated his effects, and would have stoned him to death, had he not taken refuge in a temple. Two Athenian generals, after one naval victory, being intent on a second, deputed Theramenes to perform

(a) Lib. 5.

the last duty to their dead. A violent storm prevented Theramenes from executing the trust reposed in him; but it did not prevent the people of Athens from putting their two generals to death, as if they had neglected their duty. The fate of Socrates is a sad instance, of the changeable, as well as violent, disposition of a democratical state. He was condemned to death, for attempting innovations in the established religion: the sentence was grossly unjust; for he attempted no innovation; but only, among his friends, expressed purer notions of the Deity than were common in Greece at that time. But his funeral obsequies were scarce ended, when bitter remorse seized the people. His accusers were put to death without trial, every person banished who had contributed to the sentence pronounced against him, and his statue was erected in the most public part of the city. The great Scipio, in his camp near Utica, was surrounded with three Carthaginian armies, which waited only for day-light to fall upon him. He prevented the impending blow, by surprising them in the dead of night; which gave him a complete victory. This misfortune, for it could scarce be called bad conduct, provoked the democracy of Carthage, to pronounce sentence of death against Asdrubal their general. Great trading towns cannot flourish, if they be not faithful to their engagements, and honest in their dealings: Whence then the *fides Punica*? A democracy is in its nature rash, violent, and fluctuating; and the Carthaginians merited the reproach, not as individuals, but as a democratical state.

A commonwealth governed by the best citizens, is very different from a democracy, where the mob rules. At the same time, the solid foundation of such a commonwealth, is equality among the citizens. Inequality of riches cannot be prevented in a commercial state; but inequality of privileges may be prevented, by excluding no citizen from the opportunity of commanding as well as of obeying. The invidious distinction of Patrician and Plebeian

was

was a gross malady in the Roman republic, a perpetual source of dissension between two bodies of men, equally well born, equally rich, and equally fit for war. This ill-poised government would have put an end to the republic, had not the Plebeians prevailed, who were the more numerous. That reformation produced to Rome plenty of able men, qualified to govern whether in peace or in war.

A commonwealth is the best form of government for a small state: there is little room for inequality of rank or of property; and the people can act in a body. Monarchy is preferable for a large state, where the people, widely spread, cannot be easily collected into a body. Attica was a kingdom, while its twelve cantons were remote from each other, and but slenderly connected. Theseus, by collecting the people of figure into the city of Athens, and by a general assembly of all the cantons held there, fitted Attica to be a commonwealth.

When a nation becomes great and populous, it is ill fitted for being a commonwealth. Ambition is apt to trample upon justice; selfishness upon patriotism; and the public is sacrificed to private views. To prevent corruption from turning incurable, the only remedy is a strict rotation in office, which ought never to be dispensed with on any pretext *. By such rotation, every citizen in his turn governs and is governed: the highest office is limited as to time, and the greatest men in the state must submit to the sacred law of obeying as well as of commanding. A man long accustomed to power, is not happy in a private station: that corrupting habit is prevented by an alternate succession of public and

* A commonwealth with such a rotation may be aptly compared to a group of jets d'eau, rising one above another in beautiful order, and preserving the same order in descending: the form of the group continues invariable, but the forming parts are always changing.

private life; which is more agreeable by variety, and contributes no less to virtue than to happiness. It was that form of government in ancient Rome, which produced citizens without number, illustrious for virtue and talents. Reflect upon Cincinnatus, eminent among heroes for disinterested love to his country. Had he been a Briton, a seat in parliament would have gratified his ambition, as affording the best opportunity of serving his country. In parliament he joins the party that appears the most zealous for the public. Being deceived in his friends, patriots in name only not in reality, he goes over to the court; and after fighting the battles of the ministry for years, he is compelled by a shattered fortune to accept a post or a pension. Fortunate Cincinnatus! born at a time and in a country where virtue was the passport to power and glory. Cincinnatus, after serving with honour and reputation as chief magistrate, cheerfully retired to a private station, in obedience to the laws of his country: nor was that change a hardship on a man who was not corrupted by a long habit of power.

Political writers define a free state to be, where the people are governed by laws of their own making. This definition is lame; for laws made by the people are not always just. There were many unjust laws enacted in Athens during the democratical government; and in Britain instances are not wanting of laws, not only unjust, but oppressive. The true definition of a free state, is, where the legislature adheres strictly to the laws of nature; and calculates every one of its regulations for improving society, and for promoting industry and honesty among the people. If that definition be just, despotism is the worst species of government; being contrived to support arbitrary will in the sovereign, without regarding the laws of nature, or the good of society. The lawless cruelty of a King of Persia, is painted to the life by a single expression of a Persian grandee, "That every time he left the King's
" apartment,

“apartment, he was inclined to feel with his hand whether his head was on his shoulders.” In the Russian empire, men approach the throne with terror: the slightest political intrigue is a sufficient foundation for banishing the greatest nobleman to Siberia, and for confiscating his estate. The laws of that empire smell no less rank of slavery than of oppression: No person dares game with money that bears the impression of the present sovereign: a man going along the street that fronts the Emperor’s apartment, must pull off his hat; and it is a heinous trespass to write a letter with the Emperor’s name in small characters. Despotism is every where the same: it was high treason to sell a statue of a Roman Emperor; and it was doubted, whether it was not high treason, to hit an Emperor’s statue with a stone thrown at random (a). When Elisabeth Empress of Russia was on deathbed, no person durst enquire about her; and even after her death, it was not at first safe to speak of it. The deep silence of the Russians upon matters of government, arises from the encouragement given to accusations of treason. The bystanders must lay hold of the person accused: a father arrests his son, a son his father, and nature suffers in silence. The accused with the accuser are hurried to prison, there to remain till they be tried in the secret court of chancery. That court, composed of a few ministers named by the Emperor, have the lives and fortunes of all at their mercy. The nobility, slaves to the crown, are prone to retaliate upon their inferiors. They impose taxes at pleasure upon their vassals, and frequently seize all at short hand *.

Servility

(a) l. 5. ad legem Juliam Majestatis.

* The following incident is a striking example of the violence of passion, indulged in a despotic government, where men in power are under no control. Thomas Pereyra, a Portuguese general, having assisted the King of Pegu in a danger-

ous

Servility and depression of mind in the subjects of a despotic government, cannot be better marked than in the funeral rites of a Roman Emperor, described by Herodian (a). The body being burnt privately, a waxen image representing the Emperor is laid in a bed of state. On the one side sit the senators several hours daily, clothed in black; and on the other, the most respectable matrons, clothed in white. The ceremony lasts seven days, during which the physicians from time to time approach the bed, and declare the Emperor to be worse and worse. When the day comes of declaring him dead, the most dignified of the nobility carry the bed upon their shoulders, and place it in the old forum, where the Roman magistrates formerly laid down their office. Then begin doleful ditties, sung to his memory by boys and women. These being ended, the bed is carried to the *Campus Martius*, and there burnt upon a high stage with great solemnity. When the flames ascend, an eagle is let loose, which is supposed to carry the soul of the Emperor to heaven. Is that farce less ridiculous than a puppet-show? Is it not much more ridiculous? Dull must have been the spectator who could behold the solemnity without smiling at least, if not laughing outright; but the Romans were crushed by despotism, and nothing could provoke them to laugh. That ridiculous farce continued to be acted till the time of Constantine: how much later, I know not.

ous war with his neighbour of Siam, was a prime favourite at court, having elephants of state, and a guard of his own countrymen. One day coming from court mounted on an elephant, and hearing music in a house where a marriage was celebrating between a daughter of the family and her lover, he went into the house, and desired to see the bride. The parents took the visit for a great honour, and cheerfully presented her. He was instantly smitten with her beauty, ordered his guards to seize her, and to carry her to his palace. The bridegroom, as little able to bear the affront as to revenge it, cut his own throat.

(a) Lib. 4.

The finest countries have been depopulated by despotism; witness Greece, Egypt, and the Lesser Asia. The river Menam, in the kingdom of Siam, overflows annually like the Nile, depositing a quantity of slime, which proves a rich manure. The river seems to rise gradually as the rice grows; and retires to its channel when the rice, approaching to maturity, needs no longer to be watered. Nature beside has bestow'd on that rich country variety of delicious fruits, requiring scarce any culture. In such a paradise, would one imagine that the Siamites are a miserable people? The government is despotic, and the subjects are slaves: they must work for their monarch six months every year, without wages, and even without receiving any food from him. What renders them still more miserable, is, that they have no protection either for their persons or their goods: the grandees are exposed to the rapacity of the King and his courtiers; and the lower ranks are exposed to the rapacity of the grandees. When a man has the misfortune to possess a tree remarkable for good fruit, he is required in the name of the King, or of a courtier, to preserve the fruit for their use. Every proprietor of a garden in the neighbourhood of the capital, must pay a yearly sum to the keeper of the elephants; otherwise it will be laid waste by these animals, whom it is high treason to molest. From the sea-port of Mergui to the capital, one travels ten or twelve days, through immense plains of a rich soil, finely watered. That country appears to have been formerly cultivated, but is now quite depopulated, and left to tigers and elephants. Formerly, an immense commerce was carried on in that fertile country: historians attest, that in the middle of the sixteenth century above a thousand foreign ships frequented its ports annually. But the King, tempted with so much riches, endeavoured to engross all the commerce of his country; by which means he annihilated successively mines, manufactures, and even agriculture. The country is depopulated,

and

and few remain there but beggars. In the island Ceylon, the King is sole proprietor of the land; and the people are supinely indolent: their huts are mean, without any thing like furniture: their food is fruit that grows spontaneously; and their covering is a piece of coarse cloth, wrapped round the middle. The settlement of the Dutch East-India company at the Cape of Good Hope, is profitable to them in their commerce with the East Indies; and it would be much more profitable, if they gave proper encouragement to the tenants and possessors of their lands. But these poor people are ruled with a rod of iron: what the company wants, is extorted from them at so low a price, as scarce to afford them common necessaries. Avarice, like many other irregular passions, obstructs its own gratification: were industry duly encouraged, the product of the ground would be in greater plenty, and goods be afforded voluntarily at a lower price than they are at present obtained by violence. The Peruvians are a sad example of the effects of tyranny; being reduced to a state of stupid insensibility. No motive to action influences them; neither riches, nor luxury, nor ambition: they are even indifferent about life. The single pleasure they feel, is to get drunk, in order to forget their misery. The provinces of Moldavia, Walachia, and Bessarabia, situated between the 43d and 48th degrees of latitude, are defended on three sides by the Niester, the Black sea, and the Danube. The climate of that region, and the fertility of its soil, render it not inferior to any other country in Europe. Its pastures in particular are excellent, producing admirable horses, with an incredible number of sheep and horned cattle; and its industrial fruits, such as corn, wine, oil, honey, and wax, were formerly produced in great plenty. So populous was that region a few centuries ago, that the Prince of Walachia was able, in that province alone, to raise an army of seventy thousand men. Yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, the wretched policy of the Turkish government has

has reduced these provinces to be almost a desert. A despotic government stifles in the birth all the bounties of nature, and renders the finest spots of the globe equally sterile with its barren mountains. When a patriotic king travels about to visit his dominions, he is received with acclamations of joy. A despotic prince dares not hope for such reception; he is locked up in his seraglio, ignorant of what passes; and indolently suffers his people to be pillaged, without even hearing of their distresses.

At the same time, despotism, tho' calculated to elevate the sovereign above the rules of justice, and to make him the only free person in his dominions, tends above all other governments to render him insecure. He becomes odious by oppression; and every hand would be raised against him, but for the restraint of fear. A situation so ticklish, lays him open to every bold spirit, prompted by revenge to seek his ruin, or by ambition to usurp his throne. In that respect, Russia and Turkey are precisely similar: conspiracies against the sovereign are equally frequent, and equally successful. The moment an usurper seizes the palace, all obstructions vanish: all prostrate themselves before the throne, without enquiring about the possessor's title. In that manner was the present Empress of Russia established, notwithstanding a very unfavourable circumstance, that of dethroning her own husband Peter III. No free spirit regrets such events in a despotic government: the only thing to be regretted is, that they concern the monarch only; not the people, who remain abject slaves as formerly. The present Empress, sensible of her precarious situation, is intent to humanize her people, and to moderate the despotism. In that view, she has published a code of laws fit for a limited monarchy, and expressing great regard to the lives, liberties, and property, of her subjects.

But a monarchy, with all the moderation that despotism can admit,

admit, is inconsistent with liberty of the press. Political pamphlets, and even news-papers, are no less useful for instructing the King, than for securing his subjects. In France, the ministry are deprived of that means of acquiring knowledge; and are reduced to the necessity of trusting to insinuating men, who cunningly creep into favour, with a view to their own interest. After the late peace 1763, that ministry formed a plan for establishing a colony in Guiana; and no fewer than twelve thousand persons were landed there all at one time. But so grossly ignorant were they of the preparations necessary for planting a colony in the torrid zone, that contagious diseases, occasioned by unwholesome food, and want of accommodation, left not a single person alive. This could not have happened in England: every article of management would have been canvassed, and light would have broke in from every quarter.

I have insisted longer upon the deplorable effects of despotism than perhaps is necessary; but I was fond of the opportunity to justify, or rather applaud, the spirit of liberty so eminent in the inhabitants of Britain. I now proceed to compare different forms of government, with respect to various particulars; beginning with patriotism. Every form of government must be good that inspires patriotism; and the best form to enervate that noble passion, is a commonwealth founded on rotation of power, where it is the study of those in office, to do good, and to merit approbation from their fellow-citizens. In the Swiss Cantons, the salaries of magistrates and public officers, are scarce sufficient to defray their expences; and those worthy persons desire no other recompense, but to be esteemed and honoured*. A republic so modelled,

* No human work can be everlasting. The seventy-two bailiages of the extensive canton of Bern, threaten ruin to the republic. Those lucrative offices, which the

modelled, inspires virtues of every sort. The people of Switzerland seldom think of a writing to confirm a bargain: a law-suit is scarce known among them; and many there are who have never heard of an advocate nor of an attorney. Their doors are never shut but in winter. It is patriotism that Montesquieu has in view, when he pronounces virtue to be the leading principle in a republic. He has reason to term it so, because patriotism is connected with every social virtue; and when it vanishes, men regard themselves only, not their fellow-citizens. Democracy will never be recommended by any enlightened politician, as a good form of government; were it for no other reason, but that patriotism cannot long subsist where the mob governs. In monarchy, the King is exalted so high above his subjects, that his ministers are little better than servants. Such condition is not friendly to patriotism: it is as little friendly to ambition; for ministers are still servants, however much raised above other subjects. Wealth being the only remaining pursuit, promotes avarice to be their ruling passion. Now if patriotism be not found in ministers, who have power, far less in men who have no power; and thus in monarchy, riches are preferred before virtue, and every vitious offspring of avarice has free course.

Without piercing to the foundation, one can have no just notion of the various forms that government assumes in different states. Monarchy is of many different kinds, and so is a repu-

the great council appropriates to its own members, occasion a constant influx of riches into the capital. Patriotism is observed of late years to be on the decline among the citizens of Bern; and no wonder, considering that luxury and selfishness are the never-failing offspring of opulence. When selfishness becomes the ruling passion of that people, those in power will pilfer the public treasure, which is immense, and enrich themselves with the spoils of the republic. Confusion and anarchy must ensue, and the state will settle in a monarchy, or more probably in an odious democracy.

blic. Rome and Carthage, the two great rival republics of ancient times, differed widely in their original constitution. Much has been said of these republics by historians and political writers. There is one point of comparison, that will set in a clear light the difference of their constitutions, with respect to peace and war. Carthage, advantageously situated for commerce, became a great and flourishing trading town. The Carthaginians having no object but riches, admitted none into a participation of their privileges. War was against their genius: but conquest was not, if it produced wealth; and therefore they made war in order to load their new subjects with taxes. Rome, on the contrary, was ill situated for commerce: its inhabitants were from the beginning employed in war, either defensive or offensive. Their great object accordingly was power; to which end, they were always disposed to adopt as citizens the best of those they conquered. Thus Rome became a city of warriors, Carthage of merchants. The subjects of the latter were always ripe for a revolt, while the subjects of the former were always faithful. Between two such states, there could be no equality in war; and had the Carthaginians been as skilful in politics as they were in commerce, they would have avoided, with the strictest circumspection, every occasion of quarrel with the Romans. Rome employ'd its own citizens in war: Carthage had none to employ but mercenaries. In an offensive war, the object of the latter was riches; that of the former was power and glory, motives much superior, and more animating. In a defensive war, the difference is infinite between mercenaries, who have no interest but to receive their pay, and citizens, who fight for their country, and for their wives and children. What then are we to think of Hannibal, who, reversing the laws of nature, carried on war against the Romans with an army of mercenaries, was successful in every engagement, and brought them to the very brink of ruin? He certainly was the greatest

greatest General the world ever saw. If any one is to be excepted, it is the present King of Prussia.

I next compare different forms of government, with respect to the influence of opulence. Riches, which, joined with ambition, produce bold attempts for power, are however not dangerous in monarchy, where the sovereign is so far superior, as to humble to the dust the most aspiring of his subjects. But riches, joined with ambition, are dangerous in a republic: ambition will suggest the possibility of sowing dissension among the leaders; riches will make the attempt successful; and then adieu to the republic. Wealth, accumulated by commerce in Carthage and in Athens, extinguished patriotism, and rendered their democracy unjust, violent, and tyrannical. It had another bad effect; which was, to make them ambitious of conquest. The sage Plutarch charges Themistocles with the ruin of Athens. "That great man," says he, "inspired his countrymen with desire of naval power. That power produced extensive commerce, and consequently riches: riches again, beside luxury, inspired the Athenians with a high opinion of their power, and made them rashly engage in every quarrel among their neighbours." Suppress the names, and one will believe it to be a censure on the conduct of Britain. Successful commerce prompted the Carthaginians, against their natural interest, to make war for gain. Had they been successful against the Romans, both nations would have fallen a sacrifice to the ambition of Hannibal: after subduing Italy, what Carthaginian durst have opposed that glorious conqueror, returning with a victorious army, devoted to his will? That event was long dreaded by Hanno, and the wiser part of the Carthaginian senate; and hence their scanty supplies to Hannibal. But what is only a supposition with respect to Carthage, proved to be the fate of Rome. Inequality of rank, opulence, and luxury, relaxed every fundamental principle of the commonwealth, particularly rotation

of

of power, which ought to have been their palladium. Conquest at a distance, led them unwarily, in some instances, to suspend that fundamental law; of which Cæsar availed himself in his Gallic war, by debauching from their duty the best disciplined army of the republic: and it was that army, under a leader little inferior to Hannibal, which determined the fate of Rome.

A state with a small territory, such as Hamburgh or Holland, may subsist long as a commonwealth, without much hazard from the opulence of individuals. But an extensive territory in the hands of a few opulent proprietors, is dangerous in a commonwealth; because of their influence over numbers who depend on them for bread. The island of Britain is too large for a commonwealth. This occurred to a profound political writer (a) who does honour to his country; and to remedy the evil, he proposes an Agrarian law. But it is vain to think, that accumulation of land can be prevented by an Agrarian law: a trust-deed is a ready screen for covering accumulation beyond law: and dark transactions will be carried on without end; similar to what is practised, most dishonestly, by those who elect and are elected members of parliament. When such comes to be the condition of land-property, the Agrarian law will be ripe for dissolution.

In early times, we discover greater variety of character than at present; among sovereigns especially, who are not taught to govern their passions. Perusing the history of Spain in particular, one is struck with an amazing variety of character in the Moorish Kings. In some of them, outrageous cruelty; in others, mildness, and affection for their people: in some, unbounded ambition, surmounting every obstacle of justice and humanity; in others, strict attention to commerce and to every moral virtue; some heaping up treasure; some squandering all upon voluptuousness;

(a) Harrington.

some cultivating peace; some fond of war. During the nonage of society, men exert their natural bias without reserve: in the progress of society, they are taught to moderate their turbulent passions: at last mild and courtly behaviour, produced by education and imitation, give an air to men of figure as if they were all copies from one original; which is peculiarly the case in France. The mildness of external behaviour, must have a considerable influence on the internal part; for nothing tends more to soften or to suppress a passion, than never to give it vent; and for that reason, absolute monarchy in France is far from being so dreadful as it was formerly. It is at present far from being violent or sanguinary; the manners of the people having the same influence there, that laws have in a free country. The King, delicate with respect to his conduct, and dreading the censure of the world, is guilty of few excesses; and the people, tame and submissive, are easily kept in order. Among men of rank, to be discharged the court, or to be relegated to their country-seats, is more terrible than a capital punishment.

We finish this short essay with a comparison of different governments as to the execution of laws. Laws relative to property and pecuniary interest, are every where preserved in vigour, because the violation of them hurts many. Laws respecting the public, are kept alive in monarchical governments; because the King, to whom execution of law is intrusted, seldom benefits by their transgression. For a steady execution of such laws, a democracy has nothing to rely on but patriotism; and when that subsides, such laws fall asleep. The reason is, that the powers both of legislation and execution center in the people; and a multitude, frequently no better than a mob, will never with constancy direct execution against themselves.

SKETCH

(a) Harington

S K E T C H IV.

PROGRESS OF STATES from small to great, and from great to small.

When tribes, originally small, spread wider and wider by population till they become neighbours, the slightest differences enflame mutual aversion, and instigate hostilities that never end. Weak tribes unite for defence against the powerful, and become insensibly one people: other tribes are swallow'd up by conquest. And thus states become more and more extensive, till they are confined by seas or mountains. Spain originally contained many small states, which were all brought under the Roman yoke. In later times, it was again possessed by many states, Christian and Mahometan, continually at war, till by conquest they were united in one great kingdom. Portugal still maintains its independency, a blessing it owes to the weakness of Spain, not to advantage of situation. The small states of Italy were subdued by the Romans; and those of Greece by Philip of Macedon, and his son Alexander. Scotland escaped narrowly the paws of Edward I. of England; and would at last have been conquered by its more potent neighbour, had not conquest been prevented by a federal union.

But at that rate, have we not reason to dread the union of all nations under one universal monarch? There are several causes that for ever will prevent a calamity so dreadful. The local situation

tion of some countries, defended by strong natural barriers, is one of these. Britain is defended by the sea; and so is Spain, except where divided from France by the Pyrenean mountains. Europe in general, by many barriers of seas, rivers, and mountains, is fitted for states of moderate extent: not so Asia, which being divided into very large portions, is prepared by nature for extensive monarchies*. Russia is the only exception in Europe; a weak kingdom by situation, tho' rendered formidable by the extraordinary talents of one man, and of more than one woman.

A second cause is the weakness of a great state. The strength of a state doth not increase with its bulk, more than that of a man. An overgrown empire, far from being formidable to its neighbours, falls to pieces by its weight and unwieldyness. Its frontiers are not easily guarded: witness France, which is much weakened by that circumstance, tho' its greater part is bounded by the sea. Patriotism vanishes in a great monarchy: the provinces have no mutual connection; and the distant provinces, which must be governed by bawls, are always ripe for a revolt. To secure Nicomedia, which had frequently suffered by fire, Pliny suggested to the Emperor Trajan, a fire-company of one hundred

* En Asie on a toujours vu de grands empires; en Europe ils n'ont jamais pu subsister. C'est que l'Asie que nous connoissons a de plus grandes plaines: elle est coupée en plus grands morceaux par les montagnes et les mers; et comme elle est plus au midi, les sources y sont plus aisément taries, les montagnes y sont moins couvertes des neiges, et les fleuves, moins grossis, y forment des moindres barriers. *L'Esprit des Loix*, liv. 17. c. 6. — [In English thus: "In Asia there have always been great empires: such could never subsist in Europe. The reason is, that in Asia there are larger plains, and it is cut by mountains and seas into more extensive divisions: as it lies more to the south, its springs are more easily dried up, the mountains are less covered with snow, and the rivers proportionally smaller form less considerable barriers."]

and fifty men. So infirm at that period was the Roman empire, that Trajan durst not put the project in execution, fearing disturbances even from that small body.

The chief cause is the luxury and effeminacy of a great monarchy, which leave no appetite for war, either in the sovereign or in his subjects. Great inequality of rank in an extensive kingdom, occasioned by a constant flow of riches into the capital, introduces show, expensive living, luxury, and sensuality. Riches, by affording gratification to every sensual appetite, become an idol to which all men bow the knee; and when riches are worshipped as a passport to power, as well as to pleasure, they corrupt the heart, eradicate every virtue, and foster every vice. In such dissolution of manners, contradictions are reconciled: avarice and meanness unite with vanity; dissimulation and cunning, with splendor. Where subjects are so corrupted, what will the prince be, who is not taught to moderate his passions, who measures justice by appetite, and who is debilitated by corporeal pleasures? Such a prince never thinks of heading his own troops, nor of extending his dominions. Mostazen, the last Califf of Bagdat, is a conspicuous instance of the degeneracy described. His kingdom being invaded by the Tartars in the year 1258, he shut himself up in his seraglio with his debauched companions, as in profound peace; and, stupified with sloth and voluptuousness, was the only person who appeared careless about the fate of his empire. A King of Persia, being informed that the Turks had made themselves masters of his best provinces, answered, that he was indifferent about their success; provided they would not disturb him in his city of Isfahan. Hoatsang, the last Chinese Emperor of the Chinese race, hid himself in his palace, while the Tartars were wresting from him his northern provinces, and Litching, a rebel mandarine, was wresting from him the remainder. The Empress strangled herself in her apartment; and the Emperor, making

making a last effort, followed her example. The ninth Chinese Emperor of the blood of Genhizcan, addicted to women and priests, was despised by his people. A person without a name, who had been a servant in a convent of Bonzes, putting himself at the head of some robbers, dethroned the monarch, and extinguished the royal family.

The Tonquinese, after a long subjection to the Emperor of China, regained their independence, and were governed by kings of their own nation. These princes having by long peace become indolent, luxurious, and effeminate, abandoned the government of the kingdom to their ministers. The governor of Cochinchina, being at a great distance from the capital, revolted first; and that country became a separate kingdom. The governor of Tonquin, within which province the King resided, usurped the sovereignty: but respecting the royal family, he only locked up the King in his palace; leaving to the King's descendants the name of *Bova*, or King, with some shadow of royalty. The usurper and his successors content themselves with the title of *Chova*, or Generalissimo; which satisfies the people, who pierce no deeper than what eyesight discovers. A revolution of the same kind happened in Japan. Similar causes produce similar effects. The luxurious and indolent successors of Charlemagne in the kingdom of France, trusting their power and authority with the mairs of their palace, were never seen in public, and were seldom heard of. The great power of these officers, inflamed them with an appetite for more. Pepin and his successors were for a long time kings *de facto*, leaving to the rightful sovereign nothing but the empty name. Charles Martel reigned for some time without even naming a king. And at last Pepin the younger, ann. 751, throwing off the mask, ordered himself to be proclaimed King of France.

Montesquieu, discoursing of luxury in great empires, and ef-

feminacy in the monarchs, describes the danger of revolutions, from ambitious men bred to war, in the following words. En effet il étoit naturel que des Empereurs nourris dans les fatigues de la guerre, qui parvenoient à faire descendre du trône une famille noyée dans les delices, conservassent la vertu qu'ils avoient éprouvée si utile, et craignissent les voluptés qu'ils avoient vue si funestes. Mais après ces trois ou quatre premiers princes, la corruption, le luxe, l'oisiveté, les delices, s'emparent des successeurs ; ils s'enferment dans le palais, leur esprit s'affoiblit, leur vie s'accourcit, la famille decline ; les grands s'élèvent, les eunuques s'accreditent, on ne met sur le trône que des enfans ; le palais devient ennemi de l'empire, un peuple oisif qui l'habite, ruine celui qui travaille ; l'Empereur est tué ou détruit par un usurpateur, qui fonde une famille, dont le troisieme ou quatrieme successeur va dans le meme palais se renfermer encore * (a)."

Little reason then have we to apprehend the coalition of all nations into an universal monarchy. We see indeed in the history of mankind, frequent instances of the progress of nations from

It was indeed natural, that emperors, trained up to all the fatigues of war, who had effected the dethronement of a family immersed in sensual pleasures, should adhere to that virtue of which they had experienced the utility, and dread that voluptuousness whose fatal effects they had seen. But after a succession of three or four such princes, corruption, luxury, and indolence, appear again in their successors: they shut themselves up in their palace, their soul is enervated, their life is shortened, and their family declines: the grandees acquire power, the eunuchs gain credit, and children are set on the throne; the palace is at variance with the empire, the indolent statesmen ruin the industrious people. The Emperor is assassinated or deposed by an usurper, who founds a new race of monarchs, of which the third or fourth in succession, sinking again into indolence, pursues the same course of ruin, and lays the foundation of a new change."

(a) L'esprit des Loix, liv. 7. chap. 7.

small to great; but we see also instances no less frequent, of extensive monarchies being split into many small states. Such is the course of human affairs: states are seldom stationary; but, like the sun, are either advancing to their meridian, or falling down gradually till they sink into obscurity. An empire subjected to effeminate princes, and devoid of patriotism, cannot long subsist entire. The fate of all, with very few exceptions, has been uniformly the same. The governors of provinces, losing all regard for a voluptuous and effeminate monarch, take courage, set up for themselves, and assume regal authority, each in his own province. The puissant Assyrian monarchy, one of the earliest we read of in history, after having been long a terror to its neighbours, was dismembered by the governors of Media and of Babylon, who detached these extensive provinces from the monarchy. Mahomet and his immediate successors erected a great empire, of which Bagdat became the capital. The later Califfs of that race, poisoned with sensual pleasure, lost all vigour of mind, and sunk down into sloth and effeminacy. The governors of the distant provinces, were the first who ventured to declare themselves independent. Their success invited other governors, who stripped the Califf of his remaining provinces, leaving him nothing but the city of Bagdat; and of that he was deprived by the Tartars, who put an end to that once illustrious monarchy. The same would have been the fate of the Persian empire, had it not been subdued by Alexander of Macedon. But after his death, it submitted to the ordinary fate: his generals assumed regal power, each of them in the province he governed. Had not the Roman empire been dismembered by the barbarians, it would have been dismembered by the governors of its provinces. The weakness of Charlemagne's successors, hatched in France and in Germany, an endless number of petty sovereigns. About the time that a passage to the East Indies by the Cape of Good Hope was discovered, the great peninsula

sula beyond the Ganges was comprehended under the powerful empire of Bijnagar. Its first monarchs had established themselves by valour and military knowledge. In war they headed their troops: in peace, they directed their ministers, visited their dominions, and were punctual in rendering justice to high and low. The people carried on an extensive and lucrative commerce, which brought a revenue to the Emperor that enabled him to maintain a standing army of 100,000 foot, 30,000 horse, and 700 elephants. But prosperity and opulence ruined all. The Emperors, poisoned with pride and voluptuousness, were now contented with swelling titles, instead of solid fame. *King of kings*, and *Husband of a thousand wives*, were at the head of a long catalogue of such pompous, but empty epithets. Corrupted by flattery, they affected divine honours, and appeared rarely in public; leaving the care of their dominions to their ministers, and to the governors of their provinces. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, neighbouring princes encroached on all sides. In the 1565, Bijnagar the capital was taken and sacked by four Moorish kings. The governors of the provinces declared themselves independent; and out of that great empire sprung the kingdoms of Golconda, Visapour, and several others. The empire of Hindostan, once widely extended, is now reduced to a very small kingdom, under a prince who no longer is intitled to be designed the Great Mogul; the governors of his provinces having, as usual, declared themselves independent.

Our North-American colonies are in a prosperous condition, increasing rapidly in population, and in opulence. The colonists have the spirit of a free people, and are enflamed with patriotism. Their population will equal that of Britain and Ireland in less than a century; and they will then be a match for the mother-country, if they chuse to be independent: every advantage will be on their side, as the attack must be by sea from a very great distance. Being

ing thus delivered from a foreign yoke, their first care will be the choice of a proper government; and it is not difficult to foresee what government will be chosen. A people animated with the new blessings of liberty and independence, will not incline to a kingly government. The Swiss cantons joined in a federal union, for protection against the potent house of Austria; and the Dutch embraced the like union, for protection against the more potent King of Spain. But our colonies will never join in such a union; because they have no potent neighbour, and because they have an aversion to each other. We may pronounce then with tolerable certainty, that each colony will chuse for itself a republican government. And their present constitution prepares them for it: they have a senate; and they have an assembly representing the people. No change will be necessary, but to drop the governor who represents the King of Britain. And thus a part of a great state will be converted into many small states.

SKETCH

Our North-American colonies are in a prosperous condition, increasing rapidly in population and in opulence. The colonies have the spirit of a free people, and are saturated with patriotism. Their population will equal that of Britain and Ireland in less than a century; and they will then be a match for the mother-country; if they chuse to be independent: every advantage will be on their side, as the attack must be by sea from a very great distance. Be-

S K E T C H V.

G R E A T and S M A L L S T A T E S compared.

N Eighbours, according to the common saying, must be sweet friends or bitter enemies : patriotism is vigorous in small states ; and the hatred to neighbouring states no less so : both vanish in a great monarchy.

Like a *maximum* in mathematics, emulation has the finest play within certain bounds ; it languisheth where its objects are too many, or too few : and hence it is, that the most heroic actions are performed in a state of moderate extent. Appetite for applause, or fame, may subsist in a great monarchy ; but by that appetite, without the support of emulation, heroic actions are seldom achieved.

Small states, however corrupted, are not liable to despotism : the people being contiguous to the seat of government, and accustomed to see their governors daily, talk familiarly of their errors, and publish them every where. On Spain, which formerly consisted of many small states, a profound writer (a) makes the following observation. “ The petty monarch was but little elevated above his nobles : having little power, he could not command much respect ; nor could his nobles look up to him with that reverence which is felt in approaching great monarchs.” Another thing is equally weighty against despotism in a small state :

(a) Dr Robertson.

the army cannot easily be separated from the people; and for that reason, is very little dangerous. The Roman pretorian bands were billeted in the towns near Rome; and three cohorts only were employed in guarding that city. Sejanus, prefect of these bands under Tiberius, lodged the three cohorts in a spacious barrack within the city, in order to gain more authority over them, and to wear them from familiarity with the people. Tacitus, in the 4th book of his Annals, relates the story in the following words. "*Vim præfecturæ modicam antea, intendit, dispersas per urbem cohortes una in castra conducendo; ut simul imperia acciperent, numeroque et robore, et visu, inter se, fiducia ipsi, in cæteros metus, crearetur **."

What is said above, suggests the cause of a curious fact recorded in ancient history, viz. That of many attempts to usurp the sovereignty of different Greek republics, very few succeeded; and that no usurpation of that kind was lasting. Every circumstance differs in an extensive state: the people, at a distance from the throne, and having profound veneration for the sovereign, consider themselves, not as members of a body-politic, but as subjects merely, bound implicitly to obey: by which impression they are prepared beforehand for despotism. Other reasons concur: the subjects of a great state are dazzled with the splendor of their monarch; and as their union is prevented by distance, the monarch can safely employ a part of his subjects against the rest, or a standing army against all.

A great state possesses one eminent advantage, viz. ability to

* "He extended the power of the præfecture, by collecting into one camp those pretorian cohorts which were formerly dispersed all over the city; that thus, being united, they might be more influenced by his orders, and while their confidence in their power was increased by the constant view of their own numbers and strength, they might at the same time strike a great terror in others."

execute magnificent works. The hanging gardens of Babylon, the pyramids of Egypt, and its lake Meris, are illustrious examples. The city of Heliopolis in Syria, named *Balbek* by the Turks, is a pregnant instance of the power and opulence of the Roman empire. Even in the ruins of that city, there are remains of great magnificence and exquisite taste. If the imperial palace, or the temple of the Sun, to mention no other building, were the work of any European prince existing at present, it would make a capital figure in the annals of his reign. And yet so little *eclat* did these works make at the time of execution, that there is not a hint of them in any historian. The beneficence of some great monarchs is worthy of still greater praise. In the principal roads of Japan, hot baths are erected at proper distances, with other conveniencies, for the use of travellers. The beneficence of the Chinese government to those who suffer shipwreck, gives a more advantageous impression of that monarchy, than all that is painfully collected by Du Halde. To verify the observation, I joyfully lay hold of the following incident. In the year 1728, the ship Prince George took her departure from Calcutta in Bengal for Canton, in China, with a cargo L. 60,000 value. A violent storm drove her ashore at a place named *Timpau*, a great way west from Canton. Not above half the crew could make the shore, worn out with fatigue and hunger, and not doubting of being massacred by the natives. How amazed were they to be treated with remarkable humanity! A mandarin appeared, who not only provided for them victuals in plenty, but also divers to assist them in fishing the wreck. What follows is in the words of my author, Alexander Wedderburn of St Germain, a gentleman of known worth and veracity, who bore office in the ship. "In a few days we recovered L. 5000 in bullion, and afterward L. 10,000 more. "Before we set forward to Canton, the mandarin our benefactor took an exact account of our money, with the names of the
"men,

"men, furnished us with an escort to conduct us through his
 "district, and consigned us dead or alive to one Suqua at Canton,
 "a Chinese merchant well known to the English there. In every
 "one of our resting-places, victuals were brought to us by the
 "villagers in plenty, and with great cordiality. In this manner
 "we passed from one district to another, without having occasion
 "to lay out a single farthing, till we reached Canton, which we
 "did in nine days, travelling sometimes by land, and sometimes
 "by water. Our case had been represented to the court at Pekin;
 "from whence orders came to distribute amongst us a sum of
 "money; which was done by the Chuntuck, Hoppe, and other
 "officers, civil and military, assembled in great state. After a
 "short speech, expressing regret for our calamity, with an eulo-
 "gium on the humane and generous disposition of their master;
 "to each of us was presented the Emperor's bounty, in a yellow
 "bag, on which was inscribed the nature of the gift. The
 "first supercargo received 450 tales in silver, the second 350, my-
 "self 250, the mate 75, and each common seaman 15; the whole
 "amounting to about 2000 tales, or L. 800. This is an example
 "worthy imitation, even where Christianity is professed; tho'
 "its tenets are often, on like occasions, scandalously perverted."
 So far my author: and I add, that this bounty was undoubtedly
 established by law; for it has not the appearance of an occasional
 or singular act of benevolence. If so, China is the only country
 in the world, where charity to strangers in distress is a branch of
 public police.
 Another advantage of a great state I mention with peculiar
 pleasure, because all who aspire to be eminent in literature, are in-
 terested in it. A small kingdom, like Denmark, like Sweden, like
 Portugal, cannot naturally be productive of good writers; because
 where there are few readers, there is no sufficient incitement to
 exert literary talents: a classical work produced at present in the

Celtic language, would be little less than a miracle. France is eminent above all other nations for the encouragement it affords to good writers: it is a populous country; it is the chief seat of taste, arts, and sciences; and its language has become universal in Europe, being the court-language every where: what wonder then is it, that French writers carry the palm? But let not the British despond; for doth not a glorious prospect lie before them? The demand for English books in America is considerable; and is increasing daily. Population goes on vigorously: the number of British already settled upon the river Ohio approach to 10,000; and the delicious country from that river down to the mouth of the Mississippi, will be filled with people whose native tongue is English. What reason is there to doubt, but that so fine a climate and so rich a soil will be productive of readers in plenty? The prospect of so many readers, tho' in distant parts of the globe, must rouse our ambition; and our ambition will be happily directed, if we lay aside all local distinctions, and aspire to rival the French writers in real merit only.

But the foregoing advantages of a great state, however illustrious, are sadly overbalanced by manifold disadvantages. The first is, the corruption of its kings, which, with a different view, is mentioned in the sketch immediately preceding. And beside corruption, there is another disadvantage that great monarchs are subjected to; which is, that being highly elevated above their subjects, they are acquainted with none but their ministers. And ministers, who, in a despotic government, are subject to no controul but that of their master, commonly prefer their own interest, without regard to his honour. Solyman Emperor of the Turks, tho' accomplished above any of his predecessors, could not escape the artifices of his wife Roxalana, and of his Vizir Rustan. They poisoned his ears with repeated calumnies against his eldest son Mustapha, a young prince of great hopes. They were not in hazard

hazard of detection, because no person had access to the Emperor but by their means. And the concluding scene, was an order from the Emperor to put his son to death (a). If a great monarch lie thus open in his own palace to the artifices of his ministers, his authority, we may be certain, will be very slight over the governors of his distant provinces. Their power is precarious; and they oppress the people without intermission, in order to amass wealth: the complaints of the people are disregarded; for they can never reach the throne. The Spanish governors of the Philippine islands, afford a deplorable instance of this observation. The heat of the climate promotes luxury; and luxury prompts avarice, which rages without controul, the distance of the capital removing all fear of detection. Arbitrary taxes are imposed on the people, and excessive duties on goods imported, which are rigorously exacted, and converted by the governor to his own use. An arbitrary estimate is made of what every field may produce; and the husbandman is severely punished if he fail to deliver the appointed quantity, whether his land has produced it or not. Many thousands have abandoned their native country; and the few miserable wretches who remain, have taken refuge among inaccessible mountains.

The corruption of a court spreads through every member of the state. In an extensive kingdom, powerful above its neighbours, the subjects, having no occasion to exert themselves in defence of their country, lose their manhood, and become cowards. At the same time, great inequality of rank and fortune engenders luxury, selfishness, and sensuality*. The fine arts, it is true,

gain

(a) See Dr Robertson's history of Charles V. where this incident is related with uncommon spirit.

* The following passage is from a late Russian writer. "It is a truth founded

" on

gain ground, manufactures are perfected, and courtly manners prevail; but every manly virtue is gone; and not a soul to be found, who will venture his life to save his country. That disease is spreading in Britain; and the only circumstance that guards France from equal pusillanimity, is an established mode, that every gentleman must serve some campaigns in the army.

A third disadvantage of an extensive monarchy is, that it is liable to internal convulsions or revolutions, occasioned commonly either by a standing army, or by the governors of distant provinces. With respect to the former, the government of a great kingdom enervated by luxury, will always be military, and consequently despotic. A numerous army will soon learn to condemn a pusillanimous leader, and to break loose from every tie of subjection: the sovereign is often changed at the caprice of the army; but despotism continues invariable. In Turkey, Janisaries dethrone the Sultan, without scruple; but being superstitiously attached to the royal family, they confine themselves to it in electing a new Sultan. The pretorian bands were the Janisaries of the Roman empire, who never scrupled to dethrone the Emperor on the slightest disobligation. But as there was no royal family, they commonly carried the crown to market, and bestow'd it on the highest bidder. With respect to the latter, the governors of distant provinces,

“on experience, that commerce polishes manners: but it is also a truth, that
 “commerce, by exciting luxury, corrupts manners. With the increase of foreign
 “fashions and foreign commerce in Russia, foreign luxury has increased there in
 “proportion, universal dissipation has taken the lead, and profligacy of manners
 “has followed. Great landlords squeeze and grind their people, to supply the in-
 “cessant demands of luxury: the miserable peasant, disabled by a load of taxes, is
 “frequently compelled to abandon his habitation, and to leave his land unculti-
 “vated. And thus agriculture and population diminish daily; than which no-
 “thing worse can befall a state.”

accustomed

accustomed to act without controul, become fond of power, and put no bounds to ambition. Let them but gain the affection of the people they govern, and boldness will do the rest. The monarch is dethroned before he is prepared for defence, and the usurper takes his place without opposition. Success commonly attends such undertakings; for the sovereign has no soul, and the people have no patriotism. In Hindostan formerly, some discontented favourite or souba took up arms (to avenge fancied, or perhaps affected wrongs: venturing not however upon independence, he screened himself with setting up some person of the royal blood, whom he proclaimed sovereign. The voluptuousness and effeminacy of the late kings of Persia, has rendered that kingdom a prey to every bold invader. There perhaps never existed a state that so often has changed its master, as Persia has done of late years.

In the fourth place, a nation corrupted with luxury and sensuality is a ready morsel for every invader: to attempt the conquest, and to succeed, are almost the same. The potent Assyrian monarchy, having long subsisted in peace without a single enemy, sunk into sloth and effeminacy, and became an easy prey to the kings of Media and Babylon. These two nations, in like circumstances of sloth and effeminacy, were in their turn swallow'd up by Cyrus King of Persia. And the great empire of Persia, running the same course, was subdued by Alexander of Macedon with a small army of thirty-five thousand men*.

And this leads to a fifth disadvantage of a great empire, which

* In Europe, neighbouring nations differ little in manners, or in fortitude. In Asia, we step instantly from the fierce Tartars, inhabiting a cold and barren country, to the effeminate people of a country warm and fertile. Hence in Asia perpetual conquests from north to south, to which even the great wall of China makes scarce any obstacle.

is, the difficulty of guarding its frontiers. A kingdom, like an animal, becomes weak in proportion to its excess above a certain size. France and Spain would be less fitted for defence, were they enlarged beyond their present extent: Spain in particular was a very weak kingdom, while it comprehended the Netherlands and the half of Italy. In their present size, forces are soon collected to guard the most distant frontiers. Months are required to assemble troops in an overgrown kingdom like Persia: if an army be defeated at the frontier, it must disperse, fortified places being seldom within reach. The victor, advancing with celerity, lays siege to the capital, before the provincial troops can be formed into a regular army: the capital is taken, the empire dissolved, and the conqueror at leisure disputes the provinces with their governors. The Philippine islands made formerly a part of the extensive empire of China; but as they were too distant to be protected, or well governed, it shew'd consummate wisdom in the Chinese government to abandon them, with several other distant provinces.

A small state, on the other hand, is easily guarded. The Greek republics thought themselves sufficiently fortified against the Great King, by their courage, their union, and their patriotism. The Spanish Christians, beat out of the open country by the Saracens, retired to the mountains of Asturia, and elected Don Pelayo to be their King. That warlike prince walled none of his towns, nor did he fortify a single pass; knowing, that while his people were brave, they would be invincible; and that walls and strong-holds serve but to abate courage. The Romans, while circumscribed within Italy, never thought of any defence against an enemy but good troops. When they had acquired a vast empire, even the Rhine appeared a barrier too weak: the numberless forts and legions that covered their frontiers could not defend them from a
panic

panic upon every motion of the barbarians*. A nation in which the reciprocal duties of sovereign and subject are conscientiously fulfilled, and in which the people love their country and their governors, may be deemed invincible; provided due care be taken of the military branch. Every particular is reversed in a great empire: individuals grasp at money, *per fas aut nefas*, to lavish it upon pleasure: the governors of distant provinces tyrannize without control, and, during the short period of their power, neglect no means, however oppressive, to amass wealth. Thus were the Roman provinces governed; and the people, who could not figure a greater tyrant than a Roman proconsul, were ready to embrace every change. The Romans accordingly were sensible, that to force their barrier, and to dismember their empire, were in effect the same. In our times, the nations whose frontiers lie open, would make the most resolute stand against an invader; witness the German states, and the Swiss cantons. Italy enjoys the strongest natural barrier of any country that is not an island; and yet for centuries has been a prey to every invader.

Two methods have been practised for securing the frontiers of an extensive empire: one is, to lay the frontiers waste; the other is, to establish feudatory princes in the distant provinces. Shah Abbas, King of Persia, in order to prevent the inroads of the Turks, laid waste part of Armenia, carrying the inhabitants to Ispahan, and treating them with great humanity. Land is not much valued by the great monarchs of Asia: it is precious in the smaller kingdoms of Europe, and the frontiers are commonly guarded by fortified towns. The other frontiers of Persia are guarded by feudatory princes; and the same method is practised in China, in Hindostan, and in the Turkish empire. The princes of Little Tartary, Moldavia, and Wallachia, have been long a security to the Grand Signior against his powerful neighbours in Europe.

* The use of cannon, which place the weak and strong upon a level, is the only resource of the luxurious and opulent against the poor and hardy.

S K E T C H VI.

WAR and PEACE compared.

NO complaints are more frequent than against the weather, when it suits not our purpose: "A dismal season! we shall be drowned, or we shall be burnt up." And yet wise men think, that there might be more occasion to complain, were the weather left to our own direction. The weather is not the only instance of distrusting Providence: it is a common topic to declaim against war; "Scourge of nations, Destroyer of the human race, Bane of arts and industry! Will the world never become wise! will war never have an end!" Manifold indeed are the blessings of peace; but doth war never produce any good? A fair comparison may possibly make it doubtful, whether war, like the weather, ought not to be resigned to the conduct of Providence: seldom are we in the right when we repine at its dispensations.

The blessings of peace are too well known to need illustration: industry, commerce, the fine arts, power, opulence, &c. &c. depend on peace. What has war in store for balancing blessings so substantial? Let us not abandon the field without making at least one effort.

Humanity, it must be acknowledged, gains nothing from the wars of small states in close neighbourhood: such wars are brutal and bloody; because they are carried on with bitter enmity against individuals. Thanks to Providence, that war at present
bears

bears a less savage aspect: we spare individuals, and make war upon the nation only: barbarity and cruelty give place to magnanimity; and soldiers are converted from brutes into heroes. Such wars give exercise to the elevated virtues of courage, generosity, and disinterestedness, which are always attended with consciousness of merit and of dignity *. Friendship is in peace cool and

* In the war carried on by Louis XII. of France against the Venetians, the town of Brescia, being taken by storm, and abandoned to the soldiers, suffered for seven days all the distresses of cruelty and avarice. No house escaped but that where Chevalier Bayard was lodged. At his entrance, the mistress, a woman of figure, fell at his feet, and deeply sobbing, "Oh! my Lord, save my life, save the honour of my daughters." Take courage, Madam, said the Chevalier, your life and their honour shall be secure while I have life. The two young ladies, brought from their hiding-place, were presented to him; and the family, thus reunited, bestowed their whole attention on their deliverer. A dangerous wound he had received gave them opportunity to express their zeal: they employed a notable surgeon; they attended him by turn day and night; and when he could bear to be amused, they entertained him with concerts of music. Upon the day fixed for his departure, the mother said to him, "To your goodness, my Lord, we owe our life, and to you all that we have belongs by right of war; but we hope from your signal benevolence, that this slight tribute will content you;" placing upon the table an iron coffer full of money. "What is the sum," said the Chevalier. "My Lord," answered she trembling, "no more but 2500 ducats, all that we have; — but if more be necessary, we will try our friends." — "Madam," said he, "I never shall forget your kindness, more precious in my eyes than a hundred thousand ducats. Take back your money, and depend always on me." — "My good Lord, you kill me to refuse this small sum: take it only as a mark of your friendship to my family." — "Well," said he, "since it will oblige you, I take the money; but give me the satisfaction of bidding adieu to your amiable daughters." They came to him with looks of regard and affection. "Ladies," said he, "the impression you have made on my heart, will never wear out. What return to make, I know not; for men of my profession are seldom opulent: but here are two thousand five hundred ducats, of which the generosity of your mother has given me the disposal. Accept them as a marriage-present; and may your happiness in marriage equal your merit." "Flower of chivalry,"

and languid ; but in a war for glory, exerts the whole fire of its enthusiasm. The long and bloody war sustained by the Netherlanders

"valry," cried the mother, "may the God who suffered death for us reward you here and hereafter." Can peace afford so sweet a scene ?

The following incident is still more interesting : it is of a late date ; it happened among our countrymen ; and will, for these reasons, make the deeper impression. The scene of action was in Admiral Watson's ship at the siege of Chandernagore, where Captain Speke, and his son, a youth of sixteen, were both of them wounded by the same shot. The history is related by Mr Ives surgeon of the ship ; which follows in his own words, only a little abridged. The Captain, whose leg was hanging by the skin, said to the Admiral, "Indeed, Sir, this was a cruel shot, to knock down both father and son." Mr Watson's heart was too full for a reply ; he only ordered both to be carried down to the surgeon. The Captain, who was first brought down, told me how dangerously his Billy had been wounded. Presently after the brave youth himself appeared, with his eyes overflowing with tears, not for himself but for his father. Upon my assurance that his father's wound was not dangerous, he became calm ; but refused to be touched, till his father's wound should be first dressed. Then pointing to a fellow-sufferer, "Pray, Sir, dress also that poor man, who is groaning so sadly beside me." I told him that the man had already been taken care of ; and begged, that I now might have liberty to examine his wound. He submitted ; and calmly said, "Sir, I fear you must amputate above the joint." I replied, "My dear, I must." He clasped his hands together ; and, lifting his eyes toward heaven, he offered up the following short but earnest petition : "Good God ! do thou enable me to behave in my present circumstances worthy of my father." He then told me he was all submission. I performed the operation above the joint of the knee ; and during the whole time the intrepid youth never spoke a word, nor uttered a groan that could be heard at the distance of a yard. It is easier to imagine than to express the feelings of the father at this time : but whatever he felt, tears were the only expression. Both of them were carried to Calcutta : the father was lodged in the house of his brother-in-law ; and the son was placed with me in the hospital. For the first week I gave comfort to both, carrying good tidings to them of one another. But, alas ! all the good symptoms that had attended the young man, began to disappear. The Captain perceived all in my countenance ; and so unwilling was he to add to my distress, as seldom to speak about his son. One time he said, "How long, my friend, do you think my

"Billy

landers against the tyrant of Spain, made even Dutchmen heroes: they forc'd their way to the Indies during the hottest period of the war; and gained by commerce what supported them against their ferocious enemy. What have they gained since by peace? Their immense commerce has eradicated patriotism, and every appetite but for wealth. Had their violated rights been restored without a struggle, they would have continued a nation of frogs and fishermen. The Swifs, by continual struggles for liberty against the potent house of Austria, became a brave and active people, feared and courted by neighbouring princes. Their federal union has secured to them peace and tranquillity; which, notwithstanding their mountainous situation, would have sunk them into effeminacy, but for a commerce they carry on, of hiring out their men for soldiers. Monks are commonly pusillani-

"Billy may remain in a state of uncertainty?" I replied, that if he survived the fifteenth day after the operation, there would be strong hopes of his recovery. On the thirteenth he died; and on the sixteenth, the Captain, looking me steadfastly in the face, "Well, Ives, how fares it with my boy?" Discovering the truth from my silence, he cried bitterly, squeezed my hand, and begged me to leave him for one half-hour. When I returned, he appeared, as he ever after did, perfectly calm and serene. The excellent youth had been delirious the evening before his death; and at two o'clock in the morning, he sent me a note written with a pencil, of which the following is a copy. "Mr Ives will consider the disorder a son must be in when he is dying, and is yet in doubt about his father. — If Mr Ives is not too busy to honour this note, which nothing but the greatest uneasiness could draw from me — The boy waits an answer." I immediately repaired to him; and he had still sense enough to know me. He then said, "And is he dead?" — "Who, my dear?" — "My father, Sir." — "No, my love; nor is he in any danger; he is almost well." — "I thank God: I am now satisfied, and am ready to die." He had a locked jaw, and was in great pain, but I understood every word he uttered. He begged my pardon for having disturbed me at so early an hour; and before the day was ended, he surrendered a life that deserved to be immortal. — So far my author; and I only add, Does peace afford any scene that can compare with this in moving our sympathetic feelings?

mous:

mous: their way of life, which removes them from danger, enervates their minds, and renders them spiritless and cowardly.

Industry, manufactures, and wealth, are the fruits of peace; but advert to what follows. Luxury, a never-failing concomitant of wealth, is a slow poison, that debilitates the mind, and renders it incapable of any manly exertion; courage, magnanimity, heroism, come to be ranked among the miracles that are supposed never to have existed but in fable; and the fashionable properties of sensuality, avarice, cunning, and dissimulation, engross the mind. In a word, man by constant prosperity and peace degenerates into a mean, impotent, and selfish animal; more despicable, if less odious, than an American savage, who treasures up the scalps of his enemies as trophies of his prowess. Such are the fruits of perpetual peace with respect to individuals.

Nor is the state itself less debilitated by it than its members. Figure a man wallowing in riches, and immersed in sensual pleasure, but dreading the infection of a plague raging at his gate; or figure him in continual dread of an enemy, watching every opportunity to burn and destroy. This man represents a commercial state, that has long enjoy'd peace without disturbance. A state that is a tempting object to an invader, without means of defence, is in a woful situation. The republic of Venice was once famous for the wisdom of its constitution, and for being the Christian bulwark against the Turks; but by long peace it has become altogether effeminate. Its present principles of government are conformable to its character. Every cause of quarrel with a neighbour, is anxiously avoided; and disturbances at home prevented by watchful spies. Holland, since the days of King William, has not produced a man fit to command a regiment: and the Dutch have nothing to rely on for independence, but mutual jealousy among their neighbours. Hannibal appeared upon the stage too early: had the Romans, after their conquest of Italy, been

been suffered to exchange their martial spirit for luxury and voluptuousness, they would have been no match for that great general. It was equally lucky for the Romans, that they came late upon Macedon. Had Alexander finished his conquest of Greece, and the Romans theirs of Italy, at the same period, they would probably have been confined each of them within their own limits. But Asiatic luxury and effeminacy, which had got hold of the Greeks and Macedonians before the Roman invasion, rendered them an easy prey to the invaders. It was the constant cry of Cato the Censor, "*Delenda est Carthago.*" Scipio Nafica was a more able politician: his opinion was, to give peace to Carthage, that the dread of that once powerful republic, might preserve in vigour the military spirit of his country. What happened afterward, sets the wisdom of that advice in a conspicuous light. The battle of Actium, after a long train of cruel civil wars, gave peace to Rome under the Emperor Augustus. Peace had not subsisted much above thirty years, when a Roman army, under Quintilius Varus, was cut to pieces in Germany. The consternation at Rome was great, as there was not a fortified town to prevent the Germans from pouring down upon Italy. Instant orders were given for levying men; but so effeminate had the Romans already become, that not a single man would enlist voluntarily. And Augustus was forc'd to use severe measures, before he could collect a very small army. How different the military spirit of the Romans during the second Punic war, when several Roman armies were cut off, greater than that of Varus. The citizens who could bear arms were reduced to 137,000; and yet in the later years of that war, the Romans made shift to keep the field with no fewer than twenty-three legions (a). The Vandals, having expelled the Romans from Afric, enjoy'd peace for a century without seeing the face of an

(a) Titus Livius, lib. 26, cap. 1.

enemy.

enemy. Procopius (a) gives the following account of them. Charmed with the fertility of the soil and benignity of the climate, they abandoned themselves to luxury, sumptuous dress, high living, and frequent baths. They dwelt in the theatre and circus, amusing themselves with dancers, pantomimes, and other gay entertainments: their villas were splendid, and their gardens were adorned with water-works, beautiful trees, and odoriferous flowers: no regard to chastity, nor to any manly virtue. In that effeminate condition, they made scarce any resistance to Belisarius with an army far inferior to their own in number. The Saracens of Asia, corrupted by prosperity and opulence, were able to make no head against the Turks. About that time, the Spaniards, having by the same means become effeminate, were overpowered by the Saracens of Afric, who, remote from the corrupt manners of Asia, retained their military spirit. The wealth of the kingdom of Whidah in Guinea, from fertility of soil, great industry, and extensive commerce, produced luxury and effeminacy. The king, no less luxurious than his people, gave himself up to sensual pleasures, leaving government to his ministers. In that situation was Whidah in the year 1727, when the king of Dahomay, an inland state, requested access to the sea for trade, offering to purchase the privilege with a yearly tribute. A haughty denial furnished a pretext for war. The king of Dahomay invaded the territories of his enemy with a disciplined army, and pierced to the capital without meeting any resistance. The king of Whidah with his women had fled to an island, and his people were all dispersed. It amazed the conqueror, that a whole nation, without striking a blow, had thus deserted their wives, their children, their gods, their possessions, and all that was dear to them. The Japanese became warlike during long and bloody civil wars, which termi-

(a) *Historia Vandalica*, lib. 2.

nated, about the end of the sixteenth century, in rendering their Emperor despotic. From that period no opportunity has occurred for exercising their military spirit, except in the education of their youth: heroism, with contempt of death, are inculcated; and the histories of their illustrious heroes, are the only books that boys at school are taught to read. But the profound tranquillity that the empire now enjoys in a strict and regular government, will in time render that warlike people effeminate and cowardly: human nature cannot resist the poison of perpetual peace and security. In the war between the Turks and Venetians *anno* 1715, the latter put great confidence in Napoli di Romania, a city in the Morea, strongly fortified, and provided with every necessary for an obstinate defence. They had not the least doubt of being able to draw their whole force together, before the Turks could make any progress in the siege. But, to their astonishment, the taking of that city, and of every other fortified place in the Morea, was the work of but a single campaign. So much had the Venetians degenerated by long peace, from the courage and patriotism of their forefathers who conquered that country from the Turks. In some late accounts from China, we are told, that the King of Bengala or Bracma, having invaded Yunnan, an opulent province of China, obtained a complete victory over the Emperor's army, commanded by his son-in-law; which struck the inhabitants of that province with such a panic, that multitudes, for fear of the conqueror, hanged and drowned themselves. To what a stupor would Europe have been reduced, had the plan for a perpetual peace, projected by Henry IV. of France, been carried into execution? Conquest, in a retrograde motion, would have directed its progress from the east to the west. Our situation in an island, among several advantages, is so far unlucky, that it puts us off our guard, and renders us negligent in

providing for defence: we never were invaded without being subdued *.

Montesquieu, in a warm panegyric on the English constitution, has overlooked one particular, in which it is superior to every other monarchy; and that is, the frequent opportunities it affords of exerting mental powers and talents. What agitation among the candidates and their electors on the approach of a new parliament: what freedom of speech and eloquence in parliament; ministers and their measures laid open to the world, the nation kept alive, and inspired with a vigour of mind that tends to heroism! This government, it is true, generates factions, which sometimes generate revolutions: but the golden age, so lusciously described by poets, would to man be worse than an iron age. At any rate, better to have a government liable to storms, than to attempt a cure by the dead calm of despotism †.

Law-suits

* The situation of the King of Sardinia, environed on all sides with powerful monarchs, obliges him to act with the greatest circumspection; which circumstance seems to have formed the character of the princes of that house. These princes have exerted more sagacity in steering their political course, and more dexterity in availing themselves of every wind, than any other race of sovereigns that figure in history. *Robertson's history of the Emperor Charles V.*

† On n'entend parler dans les auteurs que des divisions qui perdirent Rome; mais on ne voit pas que ces divisions y étoient nécessaires, qu'elles y avoient toujours été, et qu'elles y devoient toujours être. Ce fut uniquement la grandeur de la république qui fit le mal, et qui changea en guerres civiles les tumultes populaires. Il falloit bien qu'il y eut à Rome des divisions: et ces guerriers si fiers, si audacieux, si terribles au dehors, ne pouvoient pas être bien modérés au dedans. Demander dans un état libre des gens hardis dans la guerre, et timides dans la paix, c'est vouloir des choses impossibles: et pour règle générale, toutes les fois qu'on verra toute le monde tranquille dans un état qui se donne le nom de république, on peut être assuré que la liberté n'y est pas. *Montesquieu, grandeur des Romains, ch. 9.* — [*In English thus: "Many writers have said a great deal on those*

Law-suits within a state, like war between different states, accustom people to opposition, and prevent too great softness and facility of manners. In a free government, a degree of stubbornness in the people, is requisite for resisting encroachments on their liberties. The fondness of the French for their sovereign, and the easiness and politeness of their manners, have corrupted a good constitution. The British constitution has been preserved entire, by a people jealous of their prince, and stubborn against every encroachment of regal power.

There is another advantage of war, which ought not to be overlooked, tho' not capital. It serves to drain the country of idlers, few of whom are innocent, and many not a little mischievous. In the years 1759 and 1760, when we were at war with France, there were but twenty-nine criminals condemned at the Old Bailey. In the years 1770 and 1771, when we were at peace with all the world, the criminals condemned there amounted to one hundred and fifty-one.

But tho' I declare against perpetual peace, perpetual war is still more my aversion. The condition of Europe was deplorable in the dark ages, when vassals assumed the privilege of waging war without consent of the sovereign. Deadly feuds, which prevailed

" those factions which destroyed Rome; but they want the penetration to see,
 " that those factions were necessary, that they had always subsisted, and ever must
 " have subsisted. It was the grandeur of the state which alone occasioned the
 " evil, and changed into civil wars the tumults of the people. There must of ne-
 " cessity have been factions in Rome; for how was it possible, that those who a-
 " broad subdued all by their undaunted bravery and by the terror of their arms,
 " should live in peace and moderation at home? To look for a people in a free
 " state who are intrepid in war, and, at the same time, timid in peace, is to look
 " for an impossibility; and we may hold it as a general rule, that in a state which
 " professes a republican form of government, if the people are quiet and peace-
 " able, there is no real liberty."

universally, threatened dissolution of all government: the human race never were in a more woful condition. But anarchy never fails soon or late to provide a cure against itself, which effeminacy produced by long peace never does. Revenge and cruelty, it is true, are the fruits of war; but so are likewise firmness of mind and undaunted courage; which are exerted with better will in behalf of virtue than of revenge. The crusades were what first gave a turn to the fierce manners of our ancestors. A religious enterprise, which united numbers, formerly at variance, enlarged the sphere of social affection, and sweetened the manners of Christians to one another. These crusades filled Europe with heroes, who, at home, were ready for any new enterprise that promised laurels. Moved with the oppressive and miserable consequences of deadly feuds, they joined in bonds of chivalry for succouring the distressed, for redressing wrongs, and for protecting widows and orphans. Such heroism enflamed every one who was fond of glory and warlike atchievements. Chivalry was relished by men of birth; and even kings were proud to be of the order. An institution, blending together valour, religion, and gallantry, was wonderfully agreeable to a martial people, and tended strongly to improve their manners: humanity and gentleness could not but prevail in a society, whose profession it was, to succour every person in distress. And as glory and honour were the only wished-for recompence, chivalry was esteemed the school of honour, of truth, and of fidelity. Thus, truth without disguise, and a scrupulous adherence to promises, became the distinguishing virtues of a gentleman. It is true, that the enthusiasm of protecting widows and orphans, degenerated sometimes into extravagance; witness knights who wandered about in quest of adventures. But it would be unfair to condemn the whole order, because a few of their number were foolish. The true spirit of chivalry produced undoubtedly a signal reformation in the manners of Europe. To
what

what other cause can we so justly ascribe the point of honour, and that humanity in war, which characterize modern manners (a)? Are peace, luxury, and selfishness, capable of producing such effects?

That man should be the only animal who makes war upon his own kind, may at first appear strange and unaccountable. Would men listen to cool reason, they never would make war. Hear the celebrated Rousseau on that subject. “Un prince, qui pour reculer ses frontières, perd autant de ses anciens sujets qu’il en acquiert de nouveaux, s’affoiblit en s’agrandissant; parce qu’avec un plus grand espace à défendre, il n’a pas plus de défenses. On ne peut ignorer, que par la manière dont la guerre se fait aujourd’hui, la moindre dépopulation qu’elle produit est celle qui se fait dans les armées: c’est bien-là la perte apparente et sensible; mais il s’en fait en même tems dans tout l’état une plus grave et plus irréparable que celle des hommes qui meurent, par ceux qui ne naissent pas, par l’augmentation des impôts, par l’interruption du commerce, par la désertion des campagnes, par l’abandon de l’agriculture; ce mal qu’on n’apparçoit point d’abord, se fait sentir cruellement dans la suite: et c’est alors qu’on est étonné d’être si foible, pour s’être rendu si puissant. Ce qui rend encore les conquêtes moins intéressantes, c’est qu’on fait maintenant par quels moyens on peut doubler et tripler sa puissance, non seulement sans étendre son territoire, mais quelquefois en le resserrant, comme fit très sagement l’Empereur Adrien. On fait que ce sont les hommes seuls qui font la force des Rois; et c’est une proposition qui découle de ce que je viens de dire, que de deux états qui nourrissent le même nombre d’habitans, celui qui occupe une moindre étendue de terre, est réellement le plus puissant. C’est donc par de bonnes

(a) Dr Robertson’s history of the Emperor Charles V.

“loix,

“loix, par une sage police, par de grandes vues économiques, qu’un souverain judicieux est sûr d’augmenter ses forces, sans rien donner au hazard *.” But war is necessary for man, being a school for improving every manly virtue; and Providence renders kings blind with respect to their true interest, in order that war may sometimes take place. To rely upon Providence in the government of this world, is the wisdom of man.

Upon the whole, perpetual war is bad, because it converts men into beasts of prey: perpetual peace is worse, because it converts men into beasts of burden. To prevent such woful degeneracy on both hands, war and peace alternately are the only effectual means; and these means are adopted by Providence.

* “A prince, who in extending his territories sustains the loss of as many of his old subjects as he acquires new, weakens in fact his power while he aims at strengthening it: he increases the territory to be defended, while the number of defenders is not increased. Who does not know, that in the modern manner of making war, the greatest depopulation is not from the havock made in the armies? That indeed is the obvious and apparent destruction; but there is, at the same time, in the state a loss much more severe and irreparable; not that thousands are cut off, but that thousands are not born: population is wounded by the increase of taxes, by the interruption of commerce, by the desertion of the country, and by the stagnation of agriculture: the misfortune which is overlooked at first, is severely felt in the event; and it is then that we are astonished to find we have been growing weak, while increasing our power. What renders every new conquest still the less valuable, is the consideration of the possibility of doubling and tripling a nation’s power, without extending its territory, nay, even by diminishing it. The Emperor Adrian knew this, and wisely practised it. The numbers of the subjects are the strength of the prince: and a consequence of what I have said is this proposition, That of two states equal in the number of inhabitants, that is in reality the more powerful which occupies the smaller territory. It is by good laws, by a salutary police, and great economical schemes, that a wise sovereign gains a sure augmentation of strength, without trusting any thing to the fortune of his arms.”

SKETCH

S K E T C H VII.

Rise and Fall of PATRIOTISM.

THE members of a tribe, in their original state of hunting and fishing, being little united but by a common language, have no notion of a *patria*; and scarce any notion of society, unless when they join in an expedition against an enemy, or against wild beasts. The shepherd-state, where flocks and herds are possessed in common, gives a clear notion of a common interest; but still none of a *patria*. The sense of a *patria* begins to unfold itself, when a people leave off wandering, to settle upon a territory which they call their own. Agriculture connects them together; and government still more: they become fellow-citizens; and the territory is termed the *patria* of every person born in it. It is so ordered by Providence, that a man's country, and his countrymen, are to him in conjunction an object of a peculiar affection, termed *amor patrie*, or *patriotism*; an affection that rises high among a people intimately connected by regular government, by husbandry, by commerce, and by a common interest. "Cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propinqui, familiares; sed omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est: pro qua quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere *?"

* "Our parents are dear to us; so are our children, our relations, and our friends: all these our country comprehends; and shall we fear to die for our country?"

Social

Social passions and affections, beside being greatly more agreeable than selfish, are those only which command our esteem (a). Patriotism stands at the head of social affections; and stands so high in our esteem, that no actions but what proceed from it are termed grand or heroic. When that affection appears so agreeable in contemplation, how sweet, how elevating, must it be in those whom it inspires! Like vigorous health, it beats constantly with an equal pulse: like the vestal fire, it never is extinguished. No source of enjoyment is more plentiful than patriotism, where it is the ruling passion: it triumphs over every selfish motive, and is a firm support to every virtue. In fact, where-ever it prevails, the morals of the people are found to be pure and correct.

These are illustrious effects of patriotism with respect to private happiness and virtue; and yet its effects with respect to the public are still more illustrious. A nation in no other period of its progress is so flourishing, as when patriotism is the ruling passion of every member: during that period, it is invincible. Athenicus remarks, that the Athenians were the only people in the world, who, tho' clothed in purple, put formidable armies to flight at Marathon, Salamine, and Platea. But at that period patriotism was their ruling passion; and success attended them in every undertaking. Where patriotism rules, men do wonders, whatever garb they wear. The fall of Saguntum is a grand scene; a people exerting the utmost powers of nature, in defence of their country. The city was indeed destroyed; but the citizens were not subdued. The last effort of the remaining heroes was, to burn themselves, with their wives and children, in one great funeral pile. Numantia affords a scene not less grand. The citizens, such as were able to bear arms, did not exceed 8000; and yet braved all the efforts of 60,000 disciplined soldiers commanded by Scipio.

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 113. edit. 5.

Nasica. So high was their character for intrepidity, that even when but a few of them were left alive, the Romans durst not attempt to storm the town. And they stood firm till, subdued by famine, they were no longer able to crawl. While the Portuguese were eminent for patriotism, Lopez Carasco, one of their sea-captains, in a single ship with but forty men, stumbled upon the King of Achin's fleet of twenty galleys, as many junks, and a multitude of small vessels. Resolute to perish rather than yield, he maintained the fight for three days, till his ship was pierced through and through with cannon-shot, and not a single man left unwounded. And yet, after all, the King's fleet found it convenient to sheer off.

Patriotism at the same time is the great bulwark of civil liberty; equally abhorrent of despotism on the one hand, and of licentiousness on the other. While the despotic government of the Tudor family subsisted, the English were too much depressed to have any affection for their country. But when manufactures and commerce began to flourish in the latter end of Elisabeth's reign, a national spirit broke forth, and patriotism made some figure. That change of disposition was perhaps the chief cause, tho' not the most visible, of the national struggles for liberty, which were frequent during the government of the Stewart family, and which ended in a free government at the Revolution.

Patriotism is too much cramped in a very small state, and too much relaxed in an extensive monarchy. But that topic has already been discussed in the first sketch of this book.

Patriotism is enflamed by a struggle for liberty, by a civil war, by resisting a potent invader, or by any incident that forcibly draws the members of a state into strict union for the common interest. The resolute opposition of the seven provinces to Philip II. of Spain, in the cause of liberty, is an illustrious instance of the patriotic spirit rising to a degree of enthusiasm. Patriotism, rou-

fed among the Corficans by the oppreffion of the Genoefe, exerted itfelf upon every proper object. Even during the heat of the war, they erected an univerfity for arts and fciences, a national bank, and a national library; improvements that would not have been thought of in their torpid ftate. Alas! they have fallen a victim to thirft of power, not to fuperior valour. Had Providence favoured them with fuccefs, their figure would have been confiderable in peace as in war*.

But violent commotions cannot be perpetual: one party prevails, and profperity follows. What effect may this have on patriotifm? I anfwer, that nothing is more animating than fuccefs after a violent ftuggle: a nation in that ftate refembles a comet, which in paffing near the fun, has been much heated, and continues full of motion. Patriotifm made a capital figure among the Athenians, when they became a free people, after expelling the tyrant Pififtratus. Every man exerted himfelf for his country: every man endeavoured to excell thofe who went before him: and hence a Miltiades, an Ariftides, a Themiftocles, names that for ever will figure in the annals of time. While the Roman republic was confined within narrow bounds, austeriy of manners, and difinterefted love to their country, formed the national character. The elevation of the Patricians above the Plebeians, a

* The elevation of fentiment that a ftuggle for liberty infpires, is conspicuous in the following incident. A Corfican being condemned to die for an atrocious crime, his nephew with deep concern addreffed Paoli in the following terms, “Sir, if you pardon my uncle, his relations will give to the ftate a thoufand zechins, be-
“ fide furnifhing fifty foldiers during the fieve of Furioli. Let him be banifhed,
“ and he fhall never return.” Paoli, knowing the virtue of the young man, faid to him. “You are acquainted with the circumftances of that cafe: I will confent
“ to a pardon, if you can fay, as an honeft man, that it will be juft or honourable
“ for Corfica.” The young man, hiding his face, burft into tears, faying, “I
“ would not have the honour of our country fold for a thoufand zechins.”

source

source of endless discord, was at last remedied by placing all the citizens upon a level. This signal revolution excited an animating emulation between the Patricians and Plebeians; the former, by heroic actions, labouring to maintain their superiority; the latter straining every nerve to equal them: the republic never at any other period produced so great men in the art of war.

But such variety there is in human affairs, that tho' men are indebted to emulation for their heroic actions, yet actions of that kind never fail to suppress emulation in those who follow. An observation is made above (a), that nothing is more fatal to the progress of an art, than a person of superior genius, who damps emulation in others: witness the celebrated Newton, to whom the decay of mathematical knowledge in Britain is justly attributed. The observation holds equally with respect to action. Those actions only that flow from patriotism are deemed grand and heroic; and such actions, above all others, rouse a national spirit. But beware of a Newton in heroism: instead of exciting emulation, he will damp it: despair to equal the great men who are the admiration of all men, puts an end to emulation. After the illustrious achievements of Miltiades, and after the eminent patriotism of Aristides, we hear no more in Greece of emulation or of patriotism. Pericles was a man of parts, but he sacrificed Athens to his ambition. The Athenians sunk lower and lower under the Archons, who had neither parts nor patriotism; and were reduced at last to slavery, first by the Macedonians, and next by the Romans. The Romans run the same course, from the highest exertions of patriotic emulation, down to the most abject selfishness and effeminacy.

And this leads to other causes that extinguish patriotism, or relax it. Factional disorders in a state never fail to relax it; for

(a) Book I. sketch 5. § 1.

there the citizen is lost, and every person is beheld in the narrow view of a friend or an enemy. In the contests between the Patricians and Plebeians of Rome, the public was totally disregarded: the Plebeians could have no heart-affection for a country where they were oppressed; and the Patricians might be fond of their own order, but they could not sincerely love their country, while they were enemies to the bulk of their countrymen. Patriotism did not shine forth in Rome, till all equally became citizens.

To support patriotism, it is necessary that a people be in a train of prosperity: when a nation becomes stationary, patriotism subsides. The ancient Romans upon a small foundation erected a great empire; so great indeed, that it fell to pieces by its unwieldiness. But the plurality of nations, whether from their situation, from the temper of their people, or from the nature of their government, are confined within narrower limits; beyond which their utmost exertions avail little, unless they happen to be extraordinary favourites of fortune. When a nation becomes thus stationary, its pushing genius is at an end: its plan is to preserve, not to acquire: the members, even without any example of heroism to damp emulation, are infected with the languid tone of the state; patriotism subsides; and we hear no more of bold or heroic actions. The Venetians are a pregnant instance of the observation. Their trade with Aleppo and Alexandria did for centuries introduce into Europe the commodities of Syria, Egypt, Arabia, Persia, and India. The cities of Nuremberg and Augs-burg in particular, were supplied from Venice with these commodities; and by that traffick became populous and opulent. Venice, in a word, was for centuries the capital trading town of Europe, and powerful above all its neighbours, both at sea and land. A passage to the East Indies by the Cape of Good Hope was indeed an animating discovery to the Portuguese; but it did not entitle them to exclude the Venetians. The greater distance of Venice
from

from the Cape, a trifle in itself, is more than balanced by its proximity to Greece, Germany, Hungary, Poland, and to the rest of Italy. But the Portuguese at that period were in the spring of prosperity; and patriotism invigorated them to make durable establishments on the Indian coast, overpowering every nation that stood in opposition. The Venetians, on the contrary, being a nation of merchants, and having been long successful in commerce, were become stationary, and unqualified for bold adventures. Being cut out of their wonted commerce to India, and not having resolution to carry on commerce in a new channel, they sunk under the good fortune of their rivals, and abandoned the trade altogether.

No cause hitherto mentioned hath such influence in depressing patriotism, as inequality of rank and of riches in an opulent monarchy. A continual influx of wealth into the capital, generates show, luxury, avarice, which are all selfish vices; and selfishness, enslaving the mind, eradicates every fibre of patriotism*. Asiatic luxury, flowing into Rome in a plentiful stream, produced an universal corruption of manners, and metamorphos'd into voluptuousness the warlike genius of that great city. The dominions of Rome were now too extensive for a republican government, and its generals too powerful to be disinterested. Passion for glory wore out of fashion, as austerity of manners had done formerly: power and riches were now the only objects of ambition: virtue seemed a farce; honour, a chimera; and fame, mere vanity: every Roman, abandoning himself to sensuality, flattered himself, that he, more wise than his forefathers, was pursuing the cunning road to happiness. Corruption and venality became

* France is not an exception. The French are vain of their country, because they are vain of themselves. But such vanity must be distinguished from patriotism, which consists in loving our country independent of ourselves.

general,

general, and maintained their usurpation in the provinces as well as in the capital, without ever losing a foot of ground. Pyrrhus attempted by presents to corrupt the Roman senators, but made not the slightest impression. Deplorable was the change of manners in the days of Jugurtha: — “Pity it is,” said he, “that no man is so opulent as to purchase a people so willing to be sold.” Cicero, mentioning an oracle of Apollo, that Sparta would never be destroy’d but by avarice, justly observes, that the prediction holds in every nation as well as in Sparta. The Greek empire, sunk in voluptuousness without a remaining spark of patriotism, was no match for the Turks, enflamed with a new religion, that promised paradise to those who should die fighting for their prophet. How many nations, like those mentioned, illustrious formerly for vigour of mind, and love to their country, are now sunk by contemptible vices as much below brutes as they ought to be elevated above them: brutes seldom deviate from the perfection of their nature, men frequently.

Successful commerce is not more advantageous by the wealth and power it immediately bestows, than it is hurtful ultimately by introducing luxury and voluptuousness, which eradicate patriotism. In the capital of a great monarchy, the poison of opulence is sudden; because opulence there is seldom acquired by reputable means: the poison of commercial opulence is slow, because commerce seldom enriches without industry, sagacity, and fair dealing. But by whatever means acquired, opulence never fails soon or late to smother patriotism under sensuality and selfishness. We learn from Plutarch and other writers, that the Athenians, who had long enjoy’d the sunshine of commerce, were extremely corrupt in the days of Philip, and of his son Alexander. Even their chief patriot and orator, a professed champion for independence, was not proof against bribes. While Alexander was prosecuting his conquests in India, Harpalus, to whom his immense treasure was

was intrusted, fled with the whole to Athens. Demosthenes advised his fellow-citizens to expell him, that they might not incur Alexander's displeasure. Among other things of value, there was the King's cup of massy gold, curiously engraved. Demosthenes, surveying it with a greedy eye, asked Harpalus what it weighed. To you, said Harpalus smiling, it shall weigh twenty talents; and that every night he sent privately to Demosthenes twenty talents with the cup. Demosthenes next day came into the assembly with a cloth rolled about his neck; and his opinion being demanded about Harpalus, he made signs that he had lost his voice. The Capuans, the Tarentines, and other Greek colonies in the lower parts of Italy, when invaded by the Romans, were no less degenerate than their brethren in Greece when invaded by Philip of Macedon; the same depravation of manners, the same luxury, the same passion for feasts and spectacles, the same intestine factions, the same indifference about their country, and the same contempt of its laws. The Portuguese, enflamed with love to their country, when they discovered a passage to the Indies by the Cape of Good Hope, made great and important settlements in that very distant part of the globe; and of their immense commerce there is no parallel in any age or country. Prodigious riches in gold, precious stones, spices, perfumes, drugs, and manufactures, were annually imported into Lisbon from their settlements on the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel, from the kingdoms of Camboya, Decan, Malacca, Patana, Siam, China, &c. from the islands of Ceylon, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Moluccas, and Japan: and to Lisbon all the nations in Europe resorted for these valuable commodities. But the downfall of the Portuguese was no less rapid than their exaltation; unbounded power and immense wealth having produced a total corruption of manners. If sincere piety, exalted courage, and indefatigable industry, made the original adventurers more than men; indolence, sensuality, and effeminacy, rendered

rendered their successors less than women. Unhappy it was for them to be attacked at that critical time by the Dutch, who, in defence of liberty against the tyranny of Spain, were enflamed with love to their country, as the Portuguese had been formerly *. The Dutch, originally from their situation a temperate and industrious people, became heroes in the cause of liberty as just now mentioned; and patriotism was their ruling passion. Prosperous commerce spread wealth through every corner; and yet such was the inherent virtue of that people, that their patriotism resisted very long the contagion of wealth. But as appetite for riches increases with their quantity, patriotism sunk in proportion, till it was totally extinguished; and now the Dutch never think of their country, unless as subservient to private interest. With respect to the Dutch East-India company in particular, it was indebted for its prosperity to the fidelity and frugality of its servants, and to the patriotism of all. But these virtues were undermined, and at last eradicated, by luxury, which Europeans seldom resist in a hot climate. People go from Europe in the service of the company, bent beforehand to make their fortune *per fas aut nefas*; and their distance from their masters renders every check abortive. The company, eat up by their servants, is rendered so feeble, as to be incapable of maintaining their ground against any extraordinary shock. A war of any continuance with the Indian potentates, or with the English company, would reduce them to bank-

While patriotism was the ruling passion of the Portuguese, their illustrious general Don Alphonso d'Albuquerque carried all before him in the Indies. He adhered to the ancient frugality of his countrymen, and notwithstanding his great power and wealth, remained uncorrupted. Tho' liberal in praising his officers, he never preferred any who attempted to gain his favour by flattery. In private life he was of the strictest honour; but as justice is little regarded between nations, it was no obstruction to his ambitious views of extending the dominions of Portugal.

rupcy.

ruptcy. They are at present as ripe for being swallowed up by any rival power, as the Portuguese were formerly for being swallowed up by them. *Queritur*, Is the English East-India company in a much better condition? Such is the rise and fall of patriotism among the nations mentioned; and such will be its rise and fall among all nations in like circumstances.

It grieves me, that the epidemic distempers of luxury and selfishness are spreading wide in Britain. It is fruitless to dissemble, that profligate manners must in Britain be a consequence of too great opulence, as they have been in every other part of the globe. Our late distractions leave no room for a doubt. Listen to a man of figure, thoroughly acquainted with every machination for court-preferment. "Very little attachment is discoverable in the body of our people to our excellent constitution: no reverence for the customs nor for the opinions of our ancestors; no attachment but to private interest, nor any zeal but for selfish gratifications. While party-distinctions of Whig and Tory, high church and low church, court and country, subsisted, the nation was indeed divided, but each side held an opinion, for which he would have hazarded every thing; for both acted from principle: if there were some who sought to alter the constitution, there were many who would have spilt their blood to preserve it from violation: if divine hereditary right had its partisans, there were multitudes to stand up for the superior sanctity of a title founded on an act of parliament, and the consent of a free people. But the abolition of party-names, have destroy'd all public principles. The power of the crown was indeed never more visibly extensive over the great men of the nation; but then these men have lost their influence over the lower orders: even parliament has lost much of its authority; and the voice of the multitude is set up against the sense of the legislature: an impoverished and heavily-burdened public, a

“ people luxurious and licentious, impatient of rule, and despising all authority, government relaxed in every finew, and a corrupt selfish spirit pervading the whole (a).” It is a common observation, that when the belly is full, the mind is at ease. That observation, it would appear, holds not in London; for never in any other place did riot and licentiousness rise to such a height, without a cause, and without even a plausible pretext *.

It is deplorable, that in English public schools, patriotism makes no branch of education; young men, on the contrary, are trained up to selfishness. *Keep what you get, and get what you can*, is the chief lesson inculcated at Westminster, Winchester, and Eaton. Students put themselves in the way of receiving vails from strangers; and that dirty practice continues, tho’ far more poisonous to manners, than the giving vails to menial servants, which the nation is now ashamed of. The Eaton scholars are at times sent to the highway to rob passengers. The strong without control tyrannize over the weak, subjecting them to every servile office, wiping shoes not excepted. They are permitted to trick and deceive one another; and the finest fellow is he who is the most artful. Friendship indeed is cultivated, but such as we find among robbers: a boy would be run down, if he had no associate. In a word, the most determined selfishness is the capital lesson.

When a nation, formerly warlike and public-spirited, is depressed by luxury and selfishness, doth nature afford no means for restoring it to its former state? The Emperor Hadrian declared the Greeks a free people; not doubting, but that a change so animating, would restore the fine arts to their pristine lustre. — A vain

(a) The Honourable George Greenville.

* This was composed in the year 1770.

attempt :

attempt: for the genius of the Greeks vanished with their patriotism; and liberty to them was no blessing. With respect to the Portuguese, the decay of their power and of their commerce, have reduced them to a much lower condition, than when they rose as it were out of nothing. At that time they were poor, but innocent: at present they are poor, but corrupted with many vices. Their pride in particular swells as high as when masters of the Indies. The following ridiculous instance is a pregnant proof: shoes and stockings are prohibited to their Indian subjects; tho' many of them would pay handsomely for the privilege. There is one obvious measure for reviving the Portuguese trade in India; but they have not so much vigour of mind remaining, as even to think of execution. They still possess in that country, the town and territory of Goa, the town and territory of Diu, with some other ports, all admirably situated for trade. What stands in the way but indolence merely, against declaring the places mentioned free ports, with liberty of conscience to traders of whatever religion? Free traders flocking there, under protection of the Portuguese, would undermine the Dutch and English companies, which cannot trade upon an equal footing with private merchants; and by that means, the Portuguese trade might again flourish. But that people are not yet brought so low as to be compelled to change their manners, tho' reduced to depend on their neighbours even for common necessaries. The gold and diamonds of Brasil are a plague that corrupts all. Spain and Portugal afford instructive political lessons: the latter has been ruined by opulence; the former, as will be seen afterward, by taxes no less impolitic than oppressive. To enable these nations to recommence their former course, or any nation in the same situation, I can discover no means but pinching poverty. Commerce and manufactures taking wing, may leave a country in a very distressed condition: but a people may be very distressed, and yet very vitious;

for vices generated by opulence are not soon eradicated. And tho' other vices should at last vanish with the temptations that promoted them, indolence and puffanimity will remain for ever, unless by some powerful cause the opposite virtues be introduced. A very poor man, however indolent, will be tempted for bread to exert some activity; and he may be trained gradually from less to more by the same means. Activity at the same time produces bodily strength; which will restore courage and boldness. By such means a nation may be put in motion with the same advantages it had originally; and its second progress may prove as successful as the first. Thus nations go round in a circle, from weakness to strength, and from strength to weakness. The first part of the progress is verified in a thousand instances; but the world has not subsisted long enough to afford any clear instance of the other.

I close this sketch with two illustrious examples of patriotism; one ancient, one modern; one among the whites, and one among the blacks. Aristides the Athenian is famed above all the ancients for love to his country. Its safety and honour were the only objects of his ambition; and his signal disinterestedness made it the same to him, whether these ends were accomplished by himself or by others, by his friends or his foes. One conspicuous instance occurred before the battle of Marathon. Of the ten generals chosen to command the Athenian army, he was one: but sensible that a divided command is subjected to manifold inconveniencies, he exerted all his influence for delegating the whole power to Miltiades; and at the same time zealously supported the proposal of Miltiades, of boldly meeting the Persians in the field. His disinterestedness was still more conspicuous with regard to Themistocles, his bitter enemy. Suspending all enmity, he cordially agreed with him in every operation of the war; assisting him with his counsel and credit, and yet suffering him to engross all the honours of victory. In peace he was the same, yielding to Themistocles

mistakes in the administration of government, and contenting himself with a subordinate place. In the senate and in the assembly of the people, he made many proposals in a borrowed name, to prevent envy and opposition. He retired from public business in the latter part of his life; passing his time in training young men for serving the state, instilling into them principles of honour and virtue, and inspiring them with love to their country. His death unfolded a signal proof of the contempt he had for riches: he who had been treasurer of Greece during the lavishment of war, left not sufficient to defray the expence of his funerals: a British commissary in like circumstances, acquires the riches of Croesus.

The scene of the other example is Fouti, a negro kingdom in Africa. Such regard is paid there to royal blood, that no man can succeed to the crown, but who is connected with the first monarch, by an uninterrupted chain of females: a connection by males would give no security, as the women of that country are prone to gallantry. In the last century, the Prince of Sambaboa, the King's nephew by his sister, was invested with the dignity of Kamalingo, a dignity appropriated to the presumptive heir. A liberal and generous mind, with undaunted courage, rivetted him in the affections of the nobility and people. They rejoiced in the expectation of having him for their King. But their expectation was blasted. The King, fond of his children, ventured a bold measure, which was, to invest his eldest son with the dignity of Kamalingo, and to declare him heir to the crown. Tho' the Prince of Sambaboa had for him the laws of the kingdom, and the hearts of the people, yet he retired in silence to avoid a civil war. He could not however prevent men of rank from flocking to him; which the King interpreting to be a rebellion, raised an army in order to put them all to the sword. As the King advanced, the Prince retired, resolving not to draw his sword

sword against an uncle, whom he was accustomed to call father. But finding that the command of the King's army was bestowed on his rival, he made ready for battle. The Prince obtained a complete victory: but his heart was not elated: the horrors of a civil war stared him in the face: he bid farewell to his friends, dismissed his army, and retired into a neighbouring kingdom; relying on the affections of the people to be placed on the throne after his uncle's death. During banishment, which continued thirty tedious years, frequent attempts upon his life, put his temper to a severe trial; for while he existed, the King had no hopes that his son would reign in peace. He had the fortitude to stand every trial; when, in the year 1702, beginning to yield to age and misfortunes, his uncle died. His cousin was deposed; and he was called by the unanimous voice of the nobles, to reign over a people who adored him.

S K E T C H

But finding that the command of the King's army was bestowed on his rival, he made ready for battle. The Prince obtained a complete victory, and his army was always ready to fight the horrors of a civil war. He bid farewell to his friends, and retired into a neighbouring kingdom.

FINANCES.

PREFACE.

IN the following slight essay, intended for novices only, it is my sole ambition to rival certain pains-taking authors, who teach history in the perspicuous mode of question and answer. Among novices, it would be unpardonable to rank such of my fellow-citizens, as are ambitious of a seat in parliament; many of whom sacrifice the inheritance of their ancestors, for an opportunity to exert their patriotism in that august assembly. Can such a sacrifice permit me to doubt, of their being adepts in the mysteries of government, and of taxes in particular? they ought at least to be initiated in these mysteries.

It is of importance, that taxes, and their effects, be understood, not only by the members of our parliament, but also by their electors: a representative will not readily vote for a destructive tax, when he cannot hope to disguise his conduct. The intention of the present sketch, is to unfold the principles upon which taxes ought to be founded, and to point out what are beneficial, what noxious. I have endeavoured to introduce some light into a subject involved in Egyptian darkness; and if that end be attained, I shall die in the faith, that I have not been an unprofitable servant to my country.

FINANCES.

THis subject consists of many parts, not a little intricate. A proper distribution will tend to perspicuity; and I think it may be fitly divided into the following sections. 1st, General considerations on taxes. 2d, Power of imposing taxes. 3d, Different sorts of taxes, with their advantages and disadvantages. 4th, Manner of levying taxes. 5th, Rules to be observed in taxing. 6th, Examination of British taxes. 7th, Regulations for advancing industry and commerce.

SECTION I.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON TAXES.

AS opulence is not friendly to study and knowledge, the men best qualified for being generals, admirals, judges, or ministers of state, are seldom opulent; and to make such men serve without pay, would be in effect to ease the rich at the expence of the poor. With respect to the military branch in particular, the bulk of those who compose an army, if withdrawn from daily labour, must starve, unless the public, which they serve, afford them maintenance. A republican government, during peace, may indeed be supported at a very small charge among a temperate and patriotic people.

people. In a monarchy, a public fund is indispensable, even during peace: and in war it is indispensable, whatever be the government. The Spartans carried all before them in Greece, but were forc'd to quit their hold, having no fund for a standing army; and the other Greek states were obliged to confederate with the Athenians, who after the Persian war became masters at sea. A defect so obvious in the Spartan government, did assuredly not escape Lycurgus, the most profound of all legislators. Foreseeing that conquest would be destructive to his countrymen, his sole purpose was to guard them from being conquered; which in Sparta required no public fund, as all the citizens were equal, and equally bound to defend themselves and their country. A state, it is true, without a public fund, is ill qualified to oppose a standing army, regularly disciplined, and regularly paid. But in political matters, experience is our only sure guide; and the history of nations, at that early period, was too barren to afford instruction. Lycurgus may well be excused, considering how little progress political knowledge had made in a much later period. Charles VII. of France was the first in modern times who established a fund for a standing army. Against that dangerous innovation, the crown-vassals had no resource but to imitate their sovereign; and yet, without even dreaming of a resource, they suffered themselves to be undermined, and at last overturned, by the King their superior. Thus, on the one hand, a nation, however warlike, that has not a public fund, is no match for a standing army enured to war. Extensive commerce, on the other hand, enables a nation to support a standing army; but, by introducing luxury, it eradicates manhood, and renders that army an unfit match for any poor and warlike invader. Hard may seem the fate of nations, laid thus open to destruction from every quarter. All that can be said is, that the Deity never intended to stamp immortality upon any production of man.

The stability of land fits it, above all other subjects, for a public patrimony. But as crown-lands lie open to the rapacity of favourites, it becomes necessary, when these are dissipated, to introduce taxes; which have the following properties; that they unite in one common interest the sovereign and his subjects, and that they can be augmented or diminished according to exigencies.

The art of levying money by taxes was so little understood in the sixteenth century, that after the famous battle of Pavia, in which the French King was made prisoner, Charles V. was obliged to disband his victorious army, tho' consisting but of 24,000 men, because he had not the art to levy, in his extensive dominions, the sum that was necessary to keep it on foot. So little knowledge was there in England of political arithmetic in the days of Edward III. that L. 1 : 2 : 4 on each parish was computed to be sufficient for raising a subsidy of L. 50,000. It being found, that there were but 8700 parishes, exclusive of Wales, the parliament, in order to raise the said subsidy, assessed on each parish L. 5, 16 s.

In imposing taxes, ought not the expence of living to be deducted, leaving the remainder of a man's stock as the only taxable subject? This method was adopted in the state of Athens. A rent of 500 measures of corn, burdened the landlord with the yearly contribution of a talent: a rent of 300, burdened him with half a talent: a rent of 200, burdened him with the sixth part of a talent; and land under that rent paid no tax. Here the tax was not in proportion to the estate, but to what could be spared out of it; or, in other words, in proportion to the ability of the proprietor. At the same time, ability must not be estimated by what a man actually saves, which would exempt the profuse and profligate from paying taxes, but by what a man can pay who lives with economy according to his rank. This rule is founded on the very nature of government: to tax a man's food, or the subject that affords

fords him bare necessities, is worse than the denying him protection: it starves him. Hence the following proposition may be laid down as the corner-stone of taxation-building, "That every man ought to contribute to the public revenue, not in proportion to his substance, but to his ability." I am sorry to observe, that this rule is little regarded in British taxes; tho' nothing would contribute more to sweeten the minds of the people, and to make them fond of their government, than a regulation fraught with so much equity.

Taxes were long in use before it was discovered, that they could be made subservient to other purposes, beside that of supporting government. In the fifteenth century, the states of Burgundy rejected with indignation a demand made by the Duke of a duty on salt, tho' they found no other objection, but that it would oppress the poor people, who lived mostly on salt meat and salt fish. It did not occur to them, that such a tax might hurt their manufactures, by raising the price of labour. A tax of two shillings on every hearth, known by the name of *hearth-money*, was granted to Charles II. his heirs and successors, for ever. It was abrogated by an act of William and Mary, ann. 1688, on the following preamble, "That it is not only a great oppression upon the poorer sort, but a badge of slavery upon the whole people, exposing every man's house to be entered into and searched at pleasure by persons unknown to him." Had the harm done by such a tax to our manufactures been at that time understood, it would have been urged as the capital reason against the tax. Our late improvements in commercial politics have unfolded an important doctrine, That taxes are seldom indifferent to the public good; that frequently they are more oppressive to the people, than beneficial to the sovereign; and, on the other hand, that they may be so contrived, as to rival bounties in promoting industry, manufactures,

nufactures, and commerce. These different effects of taxes, have rendered the subject not a little intricate.

It is an article of importance in government, to have it ascertained, what proportion of the annual income of a nation may be drawn from the people by taxes, without impoverishing them. An eighth part is held to be too much: husbandry, commerce, and population, would suffer. Davenant says, that the Dutch pay to the public annually the fourth part of the income of their country; and he adds, that their strict economy enables them to bear that immense load, without raising the price of labour so high as to cut them out of the foreign market. It was probably so in the days of Davenant; but of late matters are much altered: the dearth of living and of labour, has excluded all the Dutch manufactures from the foreign market. Till the French war in King William's reign, England paid in taxes but about a twentieth part of its annual income.

S E C T. II.

POWER of IMPOSING TAXES.

That to impose taxes belongs to the sovereign, and to him only, is undoubted. But it has been doubted, whether even King and parliament, who possess the sovereign authority in Britain, can legally impose a tax without consent of the people. The celebrated Locke, in his essay on government (a), lays down the following proposition as fundamental. "Tis true, governments

(a) Chap. 11. § 140.

" cannot

“ cannot be supported without great charge, and 'tis fit every one
“ who enjoys his share of protection should pay out of his estate
“ his proportion for the maintenance of it. But still it must be
“ with his own consent, i. e. the consent of the majority, giving
“ it either by themselves, or their representatives chosen by them;
“ for if any one shall claim a power to lay and levy taxes on the
“ people by his own authority, and without such consent of the
“ people, he thereby invades the fundamental law of property,
“ and subverts the end of government. For what property have
“ I in that which another may by right take when he pleases to
“ himself?” No author has reflected more honour on his native
country, and on mankind, than Mr Locke. Yet no name is a-
bove truth; and I am obliged to observe, tho' with regret, that in
the foregoing reasoning the right of imposing taxes is laid upon a
very crazy foundation. It may indeed be said with some colour, that
the freeholders virtually empower their representatives to tax them.
But their vassals and tenants, who have no vote in electing members
of parliament, empower none to tax them: yet they are taxed like
others; and so are the vassals and tenants of peers. Add to these
an immense number of artificers, manufacturers, day-labourers,
domestics, &c. &c. with the whole female sex; and it will ap-
pear on calculation, that those who are represented in parliament
make not the hundredth part of the taxable people. But further,
it is acknowledged by our author, that the majority of the Lords
and Commons must bind the minority. This circumstance alone
might have convinced him of his error: for surely the minority
in this case are bound without their consent; nay, against their
consent. That a state cannot tax its subjects without their con-
sent, is a rash proposition, totally subversive of government.
Locke himself has suggested the solid foundation of taxes, tho' in-
advertently he lays no weight on it. I borrow his own words:
“ That every one who enjoys his share of protection, should pay
“ out

“out of his estate, his proportion for the maintenance of the government.” The duties of sovereign and of subject are reciprocal; and common justice requires, that a subject, or any person who is protected by a government, ought to pay for that protection. Similar instances without number of such reciprocal duties, occur in the laws of every civilized nation. A man calls for meat and drink in a tavern: is he not bound to pay the bill, tho’ he made no agreement beforehand? A man is wafted over a river in a ferry-boat: must he not pay the common fare, though he made no promise? Nay, it is every man’s interest to pay for protection: government cannot subsist without a public fund; and what will become of individuals when no longer protected, either in their persons or goods? Thus taxes are implied in the very nature of government; and the interposition of sovereign authority is only necessary for determining the expediency of a tax; and the quota, if found expedient.

Many writers, misled by the respectable authority of Locke, boldly maintain, that a British parliament cannot legally tax the American colonies, who are not represented in parliament. This proposition, which has drawn the attention of the public of late years, has led me to be more explicit on the power of imposing taxes, than otherwise would be necessary. Those who favour the independence of our colonies urge, “That a man ought to have the disposal of what he acquires by honest industry, subject to no control: whence the necessity of a parliament for imposing taxes, where every individual is either personally present, or by a representative of his own election. The aid accordingly given to a British sovereign is not a tribute, but a free and voluntary gift.” What is said above will bring the dispute within a very narrow compass. If our colonists be British subjects, which hitherto has not been controverted, they are subjected to the British legislature in every article of government; and as from the beginning

ning they have been protected by Britain, they ought like other subjects to pay for that protection. There never was a time less favourable to their claim of freedom from taxes, than the close of the late war with France. Had not Britain seasonably interposed, they would have been swallow'd up by France, and become slaves to despotism.

If it be questioned, By what acts is a man understood to claim protection of a government; I answer, By setting his foot on the territory. If, upon landing at Dover, a foreigner be robbed, the law interposes for him as for a native. And as he is thus protected, he pays for protection when he purchases a pair of shoes, or a bottle of beer. The case is clear with respect to a man who can chuse the place of his residence. But what shall be said of children, who are not capable of choice, nor of consent? They are protected; and protection implies the reciprocal duty of paying taxes. As soon as a young man is capable of acting for himself, he is at liberty to chuse other protectors, if those who have hitherto protected him be not agreeable.

If a legal power to impose taxes without consent of the people, did necessarily imply a legal power to impose taxes at pleasure, without limitation, Locke's argument would be invincible, in a country of freedom at least. A power to impose taxes at pleasure, would indeed be an invasion of the fundamental law of property; because, under pretext of taxing, it would subject every man's property to the arbitrary will of the sovereign. But the argument has no weight, where the sovereign's power is limited. The reciprocal duties between sovereign and subject imply, that the people ought to contribute what sums are necessary for the support of government, and that the sovereign ought not to demand more. It is true, that there is no regular check against him, when he transgresses his duty in this particular; but there is an effectual check in the nature of every government that is not legally despotic, viz. a general

neral concert among all ranks, to vindicate their liberty against a course of violence and oppression; and multiplied acts of that kind have more than once brought about such a concert.

As every member of the body-politic is under protection of the government, every one of them, as observed above, ought to pay for being protected; and yet this proposition has been controverted by an author of some note (a); who maintains, "That the food and raiment furnished to the society by husbandmen and manufacturers, are all that these good people are bound to contribute: and supposing them bound to contribute more, it is not till others have done as much for the public." At that rate, lawyers and physicians ought also to be exempted from contributing; especially those who draw the greatest sums, because they are supposed to do the most good. That argument, the suggestion of a benevolent heart, is however no proof of an enlightened understanding. The labours of the farmer, of the lawyer, of the physician, contribute not a mite to the public fund, nor tend to defray the expence of government. The luxurious proprietor of a great estate has a still better title to be exempted than the husbandman, because he is a great benefactor to the public, by giving bread to a variety of industrious people. In a word, every man ought to contribute for being protected; and if a husbandman be protected in working for himself one-and-fifty weeks yearly, he ought thankfully to work one week more, for defraying the expence of that protection.

(a) *L'ami des hommes.*

S E C T. III.

DIFFERENT SORTS OF TAXES, with their Advantages
and Disadvantages.

ALL taxes are laid upon persons; but in different respects: a tax laid on a man personally, for himself and family, is termed a *capitation-tax*; a tax laid on him for his property, is termed a *tax on goods*. The latter is the only rational tax, because it may be proportioned to the ability of the proprietor. It has only one inconvenience, that his debts must be overlooked; because to take these into the account, would lead to endless intricacies. But there is an obvious remedy for that inconvenience: let the man who complains, get quit of his debts, by selling land or moveables; which will so far relieve him of the tax. Nor ought this measure to be considered as a hardship: it is seldom the interest of a landholder to be in debt; and with respect to the public, the measure not only promotes the circulation of property, but is favourable to creditors, by procuring them payment. A capitation-tax goes upon an erroneous principle, as if all men were of equal ability. What prompts it is, that many men, rich in bonds and other moveables that can be easily hid from public inspection, cannot be reached otherwise than by a capitation-tax. But as, by the very supposition, such men cannot be distinguished from the mass of the people, that mode of taxing, as miserably unequal, is rarely practised among enlightened nations. Some years ago, a capitation-tax was imposed in Denmark, obliging even day-labourers to pay for their wives and children. Upon the

same absurd plan, a tax was imposed on marriage. One would be tempted to think, that population was intended to be discouraged. The Danish government, however, have been sensible of the impropriety of such taxes; for a tax imposed on those who obtain titles of honour from the crown, is applied for relieving husbandmen of their capitation-tax. But a tax of this kind lies open to many other objections. It cannot fail to raise the price of labour, a poisonous effect in a country of industry; for the labourer will relieve himself of the tax, by heightening his wages: more prudent it would be to lay the tax directly on the employer, which would remove the pretext for heightening wages. The taxing of day-labourers has beside an effect contrary to what is intended: instead of increasing the public revenue, it virtually lessens it, by raising the pay of soldiers, sailors, and of every workman employ'd by government.

Taxes upon goods are of two kinds, viz. upon things consumable, and upon things not consumable. I begin with the latter. The land-tax in Britain, paid by the proprietor according to an invariable rule, and levied with very little expence, is of all taxes the most just, and the most effectual. The proprietor, knowing beforehand the sum he is subjected to, prepares accordingly: and as each proprietor contributes in proportion to his estate, the tax makes no variation in their relative opulence. The only improvement it is susceptible of, is the Athenian regulation, of exempting small estates that are no more than sufficient to afford bread to the frugal proprietor. In France, the land-tax seems to have been established on a very false foundation, viz. That the clergy perform their duty to the state, by praying and instructing; that the noblesse fight for the state; and consequently, that the only duty left to the farmer, is to defray the charges of government. This argument would hold, if the clergy were not paid for praying, and the noblesse for fighting. Such a load upon the poorest mem-
bers

bers of the state, is an absurdity in politics. And to render it still more absurd, the tax on the farmer is not imposed by an invariable rule: every one is taxed in proportion to his apparent circumstances, which in effect is to tax industry. Nor is this all. Under pretext of preventing famine, the exporting of corn, even from province to province, is frequently interrupted; by which it happens, that the corn of a plentiful year is destroyed by insects, and in a year of scarcity is engrossed by merchants. Suppose a plan were requested for discouraging agriculture, here is one actually put in execution, the success of which is infallible. "Were it related," observes a French writer, "in some foreign history, that there is "a country extremely fertile, in a fine climate, enjoying navigable rivers, with every advantage for the commerce of corn; "and yet that the product is not sufficient for the inhabitants; "would not one conclude the people to be stupid and barbarous? "This however is the case of France." He adds the true reason, which is, the discouragement husbandry lies under by oppressive taxes. We have Diodorus Siculus for our authority, that the husbandman was greatly respected in Hindostan. Among other nations, says he, the land during war lies untilled; but in Hindostan, husbandmen are sacred, and no soldier ventures to lay a hand on them. They are considered as servants of the public, who cannot be dispensed with.

It is a gross error to maintain, that a tax on land is the same with a tax on the product of land. The former, which is the English mode, is no discouragement to industry and improvements: on the contrary, the higher the value of land is raised, the less will the tax be in proportion. The latter, which is the French mode, is a great discouragement to industry and improvements; because the more a man improves, the deeper he is taxed. The tenth part of the product of land, is the only tax that is paid in China. This tax, of the same nature with our tithes paid to the

clergy, yields to the British mode of taxing the land itself, and not its product; but is less exceptionable than the land-tax in France, because it is not arbitrary. The Chinese tax, paid in kind, is stored in magazines, and sold from time to time for maintaining the magistrates and the army, the surplus being remitted to the treasury. In case of famine, it is sold to the poor people at a moderate price. In Tonquin, there is a land-tax, which, like that in France, is laid upon the peasants, exempting people of condition, and the literati in particular. Many grounds that bear not corn, contribute hay for the king's elephants and cavalry; which the poor peasants are obliged to carry to the capital, even from the greatest distance; a regulation no less slavish than impolitic.

The window-tax, the coach-tax, and the plate-tax, come under the present head, being taxes upon things not consumable. In Holland there is a tax on domestic servants, which deserves well to be imitated. Vanity in Britain, and love of show, have multiplied domestics, far beyond necessity, and even beyond convenience. A number of idlers collected in a luxurious family, become vicious and debauched; and many useful hands are withdrawn from husbandry and manufactures. In order that the tax may reach none but the vain and splendid, those who have but one servant pay nothing: two domestics subject the master to five shillings for each, three to ten shillings for each, four to twenty shillings, five to forty shillings, and so on in a geometrical progression. In Denmark, a farmer is taxed for every plough he uses. If the tax be intended for discouraging extensive farms, it is a happy contrivance, agreeable to sound politics; for small farms tend not only to population, but to rear a temperate and robust species of men, fit for every sort of labour.

Next of taxes upon things consumable. The taxes that appear the least oppressive, because disguised, are what are laid on our manufactures:

manufactures: the tax is advanced by the manufacturer, and drawn from the purchaser as part of the price. In Rome a tax was laid upon every man who purchased a slave. It is reported by some authors, that the tax was remitted by the Emperor Nero; and yet no alteration was made, but to oblige the vender to advance the tax. Hear Tacitus on that subject (a). "Vectigal quintæ et vicefimæ venalium mancipiorum remissum, specie magis quam vi; quia cum venditor pendere juberetur, in partem pretii emptoribus accrescebat *." Thus, with respect to our taxes on soap, shoes, candles, and other things consumable, the purchaser thinks he is only paying the price, and never dreams that he is paying a tax. To support the illusion, the duty ought to be moderate: to impose a tax twenty times the value of the commodity, as is done in France with respect to salt, raises more disgust in the people as an attempt to deceive them, than when laid on without disguise. Such exorbitant taxes, which are paid with the utmost reluctance, cannot be made effectual but by severe penalties, equal to what are inflicted on the most atrocious criminals; which has a bad effect with respect to morals, as it tends to lessen the horror one naturally conceives at great crimes.

Such taxes are attended with another signal advantage: they bear a strict proportion to the ability of the contributors, the opulent being commonly the greatest consumers. The taxes on coaches and on plate are paid by men of fortune, without loading the industrious poor; and on that account are highly to be

* "The tax of a twenty-fifth upon slaves to be sold, was remitted more in appearance than in reality; because when the seller was ordered to pay it, he laid it upon the price to the buyer."

(a) Annal. lib. 13.

praised: being imposed however without disguise, they are paid with more reluctance by the rich, than taxes on consumption are by the poor.

I add one other advantage of taxes on consumption. They are finely contrived to connect the interest of the sovereign with that of his subjects; for his profit arises from their prosperity.

Such are the advantages of a tax on consumption; but it must not be praised, as attended with no inconvenience. The retailer, under pretext of the tax, raises the price higher than barely to indemnify himself; by which means the tax is commonly doubled upon the consumer. The inconvenience however is but temporary. "Such extortion," says Davenant, "cannot last long; for every commodity in common use finds in the market its true value and price."

There is another inconvenience much more distressing, because it admits not a remedy, and because it affects the state itself. Taxes on consumption, being commonly laid on things of the greatest use, raise a great sum to the public, without much burdening individuals; the duty on coal, for example, on candle, on leather, on soap, on salt, on malt, and on malt-liquor. These duties however carry in their bosom a slow poison, by raising the price of labour and of manufactures. De Wit observes, that the Dutch taxes upon consumption have raised the price of their broad cloth forty *per cent.*; and our manufactures by the same means are raised at least thirty *per cent.* Britain has long laboured under this chronical distemper, which, by excluding her from foreign markets, will not only put an end to her own manufactures, but will open a wide door to the foreign, as smuggling cannot be prevented where commodities imported are much cheaper than our own.

Nor ought it to be overlooked, that taxes on consumption are not equally proper in every situation. They are proper in a populous

lous country, like Holland; because the expence of collecting is but a trifle, compared with the sums collected. But in a country thinly peopled, such taxes are improper; because the expence of collecting makes too great a proportion of the sums collected: in the highlands of Scotland, the excise on ale and spirits defrays not the expence of levying; the people are burdened, and the government is not supported.

A lottery is a sort of tax different from any that have been mentioned. It is a tax, of all the most agreeable, being entirely voluntary. An appetite for gaming, inherent even in savages, prompts multitudes to venture their money in hopes of the highest prize; tho' they cannot altogether hide from themselves the inequality of the play. But lucky it is, that the selfish passions of men can be made subservient to the public good. Lotteries however produce one unhappy effect: they blunt the edge of industry, by directing the attention to a more compendious method of gain. At the same time, the money acquired by a lottery, seldom turns to account; for what comes without trouble, goes commonly without thought.

S E C T. IV.

MANNER OF LEVYING TAXES.

TO avoid the rapacity of farmers, a mild government will, in most cases, prefer management; i. e. it will levy taxes by officers appointed for that purpose. Montesquieu (*a*) has handled that point with his usual sprightly elegance.

(a) L'Esprit des loix, liv. 13. ch. 19.

Importation-duties are commonly laid upon the importer before the cargo is landed, leaving him to add the duty to the price of the goods ; and the facility of levying, is the motive for preferring that method. But is it not hard, that the importer should be obliged to advance a great sum in name of duty, before drawing a shilling by the sale of his goods ? It is not only hard, but grossly unjust : for if the goods perish without being sold, the duty is lost to the importer ; he has no claim against the public for restitution. This has more the air of despotism than of a free government. Would it not be more equitable, that the goods should be lodged in a public warehouse, under custody of revenue-officers, the importer paying the duty as goods are sold ? According to the present method, the duty remains with the collector three years, in order to be repaid to the importer, if the goods be exported within that time : but by the method proposed, the duty would be paid to the treasury as goods are sold, which might be within a month from the time of importation, perhaps a week ; and the treasury would profit, as well as the fair trader. There are public warehouses adjoining to the customhouse of Bourdeaux, where the sugars of the French colonies are deposited, till the importer finds a market ; and he pays the duty gradually as sales are made. It rejoices me, that the same method is practised in this island with respect to some foreign articles necessary in our trade with Africa : the duty is not demanded till the goods are shipped for that continent. It is also put in practice with respect to foreign salt, and with respect to rum imported from our sugar-colonies.

Beside the equity of what is here proposed, which relieves the importer from advance of money, and from risk, many other advantages would be derived from it. In the first place, the merchant, having no occasion to reserve any portion of his capital for answering the duty, would be enabled to commence trade with a
small

small stock, or to encrease his trade if his stock be large: trade would flourish, and the public revenue would encrease in proportion. Secondly, It would lessen smuggling. Many a one who commences trade with upright intention, is tempted to smuggle for want of ready money to pay the duty. Thirdly, This manner of levying the duty, would not only abridge the number of officers, but remove every pretext for claiming discount on pretence of leakage, samples, and the drying or shrinking of goods. In the present manner of levying, that discount must be left to the discretion of the officer: a private understanding is thus introduced between him and the merchant, hurtful to the revenue, and destructive to morals. Fourthly, The merchant would be enabled to lower his prices, and be fore'd to lower them by having many rivals; which at the same time would give access to augment importation-duties, without raising the price of foreign commodities above what it is at present. But the capital advantage of all would be, to render in effect every port in Britain a free port, enabling English merchants, many of whom have great capitals, to outstrip foreigners in what is termed a *commerce of speculation*. This island is well situated for such commerce; and were our ports free, the productions of all climates would be stored up in them, ready for exportation when a market offers; an excellent plan for encreasing our shipping, and for producing boundless wealth.

S E C T. V.

RULES TO BE OBSERVED IN TAXING.

THE different objects of taxes, and the intricacy thereby occasioned, require general rules, not only for directing the legislature in imposing them, but for enabling others to judge what are beneficial, and what hurtful.

The first rule I shall suggest is, That where-ever there is an opportunity of smuggling, taxes ought to be moderate; for smuggling can never effectually be restrained, where the cheapness of imported goods is in effect an insurance against the risk; in which view, Swift humorously observes, that two and two do not always make four. A duty of 15 *per cent.* upon printed linen imported into France, encourages smuggling: a lower duty would produce a greater sum to the public, and be more beneficial to the French manufacturer. Bone-lace imported into France is charged with a duty of 20 *per cent.* in order to favour that manufacture at home: but in vain; for bone-lace is easily smuggled, and the price is little higher than before. The high duty on *succus liquoritæ* imported into Britain, being L. 7 : 2 : 6 *per hundred weight*, was a great encouragement to smuggling; for which reason it is reduced to 30 s. *per hundred weight* (a).

The smuggling of tea, which extracts great sums from Britain, is much encouraged by its high price at home. As far as I can judge, it would be profitable, both to the public and to individuals, to lay aside the importation-duty, and to substitute in its

(a) 7th Geo. III. cap. 47.

stead a duty on the consumer. Freedom of importation would enable the East-India company to sell so cheap, as effectually to banish smuggling; and the low price of tea would enable the consumer to pay a pretty smart duty, without being much out of pocket. The following mode is proposed merely as an example: it is a hint that may lead to improvements. Let every man who uses tea be subjected to a moderate tax, proportioned to his mode of living. Absolute precision cannot be expected in proportioning the tax on families; but gross inequality may easily be prevented. For instance, let the mode of living be determined by the equipage that is kept. A coach or chaise with two horses shall subject a family to a yearly tax of L. 10, heightening the tax in proportion to the number of horses and carriages; two servants in livery, without a carriage, to a tax of 40 s.; every other family paying 20 s. Every family where tea is used must be entered in the collector's books, with its mode of living, under a heavy penalty; which would regulate the coach-tax, as well as that on tea. Such a tax, little expensive in levying, would undoubtedly be effectual: a master of a family is imprudent indeed, if he put it in the power of the vender, of a malicious neighbour, or of a menial servant, to subject him to a heavy penalty. This tax at the same time would be the least disagreeable of any that is levied without disguise; being in effect a voluntary tax, as the mode of living is voluntary. Nor would it be difficult to temper the tax, so as to afford a greater sum to the public than it receives at present from the importation-duty, and yet to cost our people no more for tea than they pay at present, taking into computation the high price of that commodity.

High duties on importation are immoral, as well as impolitic; and it would be unjustifiable in the legislature, first to tempt, and then to punish for yielding to the temptation.

A second rule is, That taxes expensive in the levying ought to be

avoided ; being heavy on the people, without a proportional benefit to the revenue. Our land-tax is admirable : it affords a great sum, levied with very little expence. The duties on coaches, and on gold and silver plate, are similar ; and so would be the tax on tea above proposed. The taxes that are the most hurtful to trade and manufactures, such as the duty on soap, candle, leather, are expensive in levying.

A third rule is, To avoid arbitrary taxes. They are disgusting to all, not excepting those who are favourably treated ; because self-partiality seldom permits a man to think, that justice is done him in such matters. A tax laid on persons in proportion to their trade, or their opulence, must be arbitrary, even where strict justice is intended ; because it depends on the vague opinion or conjecture of the collector : every man thinks himself injured ; and the sum levied does not balance the discontent it occasions. The tax laid on the French farmer in proportion to his substance, is an intolerable grievance, and a great engine of oppression : if the farmer exert any activity in meliorating his land, he is sure to be doubly taxed. Hamburgh affords the only instance of a tax on trade and riches, that is willingly paid, and that consequently is levied without oppression. Every merchant puts privately into the public chest, the sum that in his own opinion he ought to contribute : A singular example of integrity in a great trading town ; for there is no suspicion of wrong in that tacit contribution. But this state is not yet corrupted by luxury.

Because many vices that poison a nation, arise from inequality of riches ; I propose it as a fourth rule, to remedy that inequality as much as possible, by relieving the poor, and burdening the rich. Proprietors of overgrown estates, can bear without inconvenience very heavy taxes ; and those especially who convert much land from profit to pleasure, ought not to be spared. Would it not contribute greatly to the public good, that a tax of L. 50 should

should be laid on every house that has 50 windows; L. 150 on houses of 100 windows; and L. 400 on houses of 200 windows. By the same principle, every deer-park of 200 acres ought to pay L. 50; of 500 acres L. 200; and of 1000 acres L. 600. Fifty acres of pleasure ground to pay L. 30; 100 such acres L. 80; 150 acres L. 200; and 200 acres L. 300. Such a tax would have another good effect: it would probably move high-minded men to leave out more ground for maintenance of the poor, than they are commonly inclined to do.

A fifth rule of capital importance, as it regards the interest of the state in general is, That every tax which tends to impoverish the nation ought to be rejected with indignation. Such taxes contradict the very nature of government, which is to protect, not to oppress. And supposing the interest of the governing power to be only regarded, a state is not measured by the extent of its territory, but by what the subjects are able to pay annually without end. A sovereign, however regardless of his duty as father of his people, will regard that rule for his own sake: a nation impoverished by oppressive taxes, will reduce the sovereign at last to the same poverty; for he cannot levy what they cannot pay.

Whether taxes imposed on common necessities, which fall heavy upon the labouring poor, be of the kind now mentioned, deserves the most serious consideration. Where they tend to promote industry, they are highly salutary: where they deprive us of foreign markets, by raising the price of labour, and of manufactures, they are highly noxious. In some cases, industry may be promoted by taxes, without raising the price of labour and of manufactures. Tobolski in Siberia is a populous town, the price of vivres is extremely low, and the people on that account are extremely idle. While they are masters of a farthing, they work none: when they are pinched with hunger, they gain in a day what maintains them a week: they never think of to-morrow, nor of providing against want. A tax there upon necessities would

would probably excite some degree of industry. Such a tax, renewed from time to time, and augmented gradually, would promote industry more and more, so as to squeeze out of that lazy people three, four, or even five days labour weekly, without raising their wages, or the price of their work. But beware of a general rule. The effect would be very different in Britain, where moderate labour, without much relaxation, is requisite for living comfortably: in every such case, a permanent tax upon necessities will not fail in time to raise the price of labour. It is true, that in a single year of scarcity there is commonly more labour, and even better living, than in plentiful years. But suppose scarcity to continue a number of years successively, or suppose a permanent tax on necessities, wages must rise till the labourer find comfortable living: if the employer obstinately stand out, the labourer will in despair abandon work altogether, and commence beggar; or will retire to a country less burdened with taxes. Hence a salutary doctrine, That where expence of living equals, or nearly equals, what is gained by bodily labour, moderate taxes renewed from time to time after considerable intervals, will promote industry, without raising the price of labour; but that permanent taxes will unavoidably raise the price of labour, and of manufactures. In Holland, the high price of provisions and of labour, occasioned by permanent taxes, have excluded from the foreign market every one of their manufactures that can be supplied by other nations. Heavy taxes have put an end to their once flourishing manufactures of wool, of silk, of gold and silver, and many others. The prices of labour and of manufactures have in England been immoderately raised by the same means.

To prevent a total downfall of our manufactures, several political writers have given their opinion, that the labouring poor ought to be disburdened of all taxes. The royal tithe proposed for France, instead of all other taxes, published in the name of

Mareschal

Mareschal Vauban, or such a tax laid upon land in England, might originally have produced wonders. But the expedient would now come too late, at least in England: such profligacy have the poor-rates produced among the lower ranks, that to relieve them from taxes, would probably make them work less, but assuredly would not make them work cheaper. It is vain therefore to think of a remedy against idleness and high wages, while the poor-rates subsist in their present form. Davenant pronounces, that the English poor-rates will in time be the bane of their manufactures. He computes, that the persons receiving alms in England amount to one million and two hundred thousand, the half of whom at least would have continued to work, had they not relied on parish-charity. But of this more at large in a separate sketch.

Were the poor-rates abolished, a general act of naturalization would not only augment the strength of Britain, by adding to the number of its people, but would compel the natives to work cheaper, and consequently to be more industrious.

If these expedients be not relished, the only one that remains for preserving our manufactures is, to encourage their exportation by a bounty, such as may enable us to cope with our rivals in foreign markets. But where is the fund for a bounty so extensive? It may be raised out of land, like the Athenian tax above mentioned, burdening great proprietors in a geometrical proportion, and freeing those who have not above L. 100 of land-rent. That tax would raise a great sum to the public, without any real loss to those who are burdened; for comparative riches would remain the same as formerly. Nay such a tax would in time prove highly beneficial to land-proprietors; for by promoting industry and commerce, it would raise the rent of land much above the contribution. Can money be laid out so advantageously at common interest? And to reconcile land-holders to the tax, may it not

not be thought sufficient, that, without a bounty, our foreign commerce must vanish, and land be reduced to its original low value? Can any man hesitate about paying a shilling, when it ensures him against losing a pound?

I shall close with a rule of deeper concern than all that have been mentioned, which is, To avoid taxes that require the oath of party. They are *contra bonos mores*, as being a temptation to perjury. Few there are so wicked, as to hurt others by perjury; at the same time, there are not many of the lower ranks so upright, as to scruple much at perjury, when it prevents hurt to themselves. Consider the duty on candle. Those only who brew for sale, pay the duty on malt-liquor; and to avoid the brewer's oath, the quantity is ascertained by officers who attend the process. But the duty on candle is oppressive, not only as comprehending poor people who make no candle for sale, but as subjecting them to give oath on the quantity they make for their own use. Figure a poor widow, burdened with five or six children: she is not permitted to make ready a little food for her infants, by the light of a rag dipped in grease, without paying what she has not to pay, or being guilty of perjury. However upright originally, poverty and anxiety about her infants will tempt her to conceal the truth, and to deny upon oath:—a sad lesson to her poor children: ought they to be punished for copying after their mother, whom they love and revere? whatever she does appears right in their eyes. The manner of levying the salt-tax in France is indeed arbitrary; but it is not productive of immorality: an oath is avoided; and every master of a family pays for the quantity he is presumed to consume. French wine is often imported into Britain as Spanish, which pays less duty. To check that fraud, the importer's oath is required; and if perjury be suspected, a jury is set upon him in exchequer. This is horrid: the importer is tempted by a high duty on French wine to commit perjury; for which

which he is prosecuted in a sovereign court, open to all the world: he turns desperate, and loses all sense of honour. Thus custom-house oaths have become a proverb, as meriting no regard; and corruption creeping on, will become universal. Some goods imported pay a duty *ad valorem*; and to ascertain the value the importer's oath is required. In China, the books of the merchant are trusted, without an oath. Why not imitate so laudable a practice? If our people be more corrupted, perjury may be avoided, by ordaining the merchant to deliver his goods to any who will demand them, at the rate stated in his books; with the addition of ten *per cent.* as a sufficient profit to himself. Oaths have been greatly multiplied in Britain since the Revolution, without reserve, and contrary to sound policy. New oaths have been contrived against those who are disaffected to the government; against fictitious titles in electing parliament-members; against defrauding the revenue, &c. &c. They have been so hackney'd, and have become so familiar, as to be held a matter of form merely. Perjury has dwindled into a venial transgression, and is scarce held an imputation on any man's character. Lamentable indeed has been the conduct of our legislature: instead of laws for reforming or improving morals, the imprudent multiplication of oaths has not only spread corruption through every rank, but, by annihilating the authority of an oath over conscience, has rendered it entirely useless.

The manner of levying the tax in France is indeed arbitrary; but it is not productive of immorality: an oath is avoided; and every master of a family pays for the quantity he is presumed to consume. French wine is often imported into Britain as Spanish, which pays less duty. To check that fraud, the importer's oath is required; and if perjury be suspected, duty is set upon him in exchequer. This is horrid: the importer is tempted by a high duty on French wine to commit perjury; for which

S E C T. VI.

EXAMINATION OF BRITISH TAXES.

T Here is no political subject of greater importance to Britain, than the present : a whole life might be profitably bestow'd on it, and a large volume. My part is only to suggest hints ; which will occur in considering taxes with regard to their effects. And in that view, they may be commodiously distinguished into five kinds. First, Taxes that encrease the public revenue, without producing any other effect, good or bad. Second, Taxes that encrease the public revenue ; and are also beneficial to manufactures and commerce. Third, Taxes that encrease the public revenue ; but are hurtful to manufactures and commerce. Fourth, Taxes that are hurtful to manufactures and commerce, without encreasing the public revenue. Fifth, Taxes that are hurtful to manufactures and commerce ; and also lessen the public revenue. I proceed to instances of each kind.

The land-tax is an illustrious instance of the first kind : it produces a revenue to the public, levied with very little expence : and it hurts no mortal ; for a landholder who pays for having himself and his estate protected, cannot be said to be hurt. The duty on coaches is of the same kind. Both taxes at the same time are agreeable to sound principles. Men ought to contribute to the public revenue, according to the benefit that protection affords them : a rich man requires protection for his possessions, as well as for his person, and therefore ought to contribute largely : a poor

poor man requires protection for his person only, and therefore ought to contribute very little.

A tax on foreign luxuries is an instance of the second kind. It encreases the public revenue: and it greatly benefits individuals; not only by restraining the consumption of foreign luxuries, but by encouraging our own manufactures of that kind. Britain enjoys a monopoly of coal exported to Holland; and the duty on exportation is agreeable to sound policy, being paid by the Dutch. This duty is an instance of the second kind: it raises a considerable revenue to the public; and it enables us to cope with the Dutch in every manufacture that employs coal, such as dying, distilling, works of glass and of iron. And these manufactures in Britain, by the dearth of labour, are entitled to some aid. A tax on horses, to prevent their increase, would be a tax of the same kind. The incredible number of horses used in coaches and other wheel-carriages, has raised the price of labour, by doubling the the price of oat-meal, the food of the labouring poor in many parts of Britain. The price of wheat is also raised by the same means; because the vast quantity of land employ'd in producing oats, leaves so much the less for wheat. I would not exempt even plough-horses from the tax; because in every view it is more advantageous to use oxen*. So little regard is paid to these considerations,

* They are preferable for husbandry in several respects. They are cheaper than horses: their food, their harness, their shoes, the attendance on them, much less expensive; and their dung much better for land. Horses are more subject to diseases, and when diseased or old are totally useless; upon which account, a stock of horses for a farm, must be renewed at least every ten years; whereas a stock of oxen may be kept entire for ever without any new expence, as they will always draw a full price when fatted for food. Nor is a horse more docile than an ox: a couple of oxen in a plough, require not a driver more than a couple of horses. The Dutch at the Cape of Good Hope plough with oxen; and exercise them early to a quick

rations, that a coach, whether drawn by two horses or by six, pays the same duty. As to the third kind, I am grieved to observe, that we have many taxes more hurtful to individuals than advantageous to the public revenue. Multiplied taxes on the necessities of life, candle, soap, leather, ale, salt, &c. raise the price of labour, and consequently of manufactures. If they shall have the effect to deprive us of foreign markets, which we have reason to dread, depopulation and poverty must ensue. The salt-tax in particular is more out of rule than any of the others mentioned: with respect to these, the rich bear the greatest burden, being the greatest consumers; but the share they pay of the salt-tax is very little, because they never touch salt provisions. The salt-tax is still more absurd in another respect, salt being a choice manure for land. One would be amazed to hear of a law prohibiting the use of lime as a manure: he would be still more amazed to hear of the prohibition being extended to salt, which is a manure much superior: and yet a heavy tax on salt, which renders it too dear for being used as a manure, surprises no man. But the mental eye, when left without culture, resembles that of the body: it seldom perceives but what is directly before it: inferences and consequences go far out of sight. Many thousand quarters of good wheat have been annually with-held from Britain by the salt-tax. What the

pace, so as to equal horses both in the plough and in the waggon. The people of Malabar use no other animal for the plough nor for burdens. About Pondichery no beasts of burden are to be seen but oxen. The vast increase of horses of late years for luxury as well as for draught, makes a great consumption of oats. If in husbandry oxen only were used, which require no oats, many thousand acres would be saved for wheat and barley. But the advantages of oxen would not be confined to the farmer. Beef would become much cheaper to the manufacturer, by the vast addition of fat oxen sent to market; and the price of leather and tallow would fall; a national benefit, as every one uses shoes and candles.

treasury

treasury has gained, will not amount to the fiftieth part of that loss. The absurdity of with-holding from us a manure so profitable, has at last been discovered; and remedied in part, by permitting English foul salt to be used for manure, on paying four pence of duty per bushel (a). Why was not Scotland permitted to taste of that bounty? Our candidates, it would appear, are more solicitous of a seat in parliament, than of serving their country when they have obtained that honour. The window-tax is more detrimental to the common interest than advantageous to the public revenue. In the first place, it promotes large farms in order to save houses and windows; whereas small farms tend to multiply a hardy and frugal race, useful for every purpose. In the next place, it is a discouragement to manufactures, by taxing the houses in which they are carried on. Manufacturers, in order to relieve themselves as much as possible from the tax, make the whole side of their house a single window; and there are instances where in three stories there are but three windows. The tax, at the same time, is imposed with no degree of equality: a house in a paucity village that affords not five pounds of yearly rent, may have a greater number of windows than one in London rented at fifty. In this respect it runs counter to sound policy, by easing the rich, and burdening the poor. The same objection lies against the plate-tax. It is not indeed hurtful to manufactures and commerce: but it is hurtful to the common interest; because plate converted into money may be the means of saving the nation at a crisis, and therefore ought to be encouraged, instead of being loaded with a tax. On pictures imported into Britain, a duty is laid in proportion to the size. Was there no intelligent person at hand, to inform our legislature, that the only means to rouse a genius for painting, is

(a) 8^o Geo. III. cap. 25.

to give our youth ready access to good pictures? Till these be multiplied in Britain, we never shall have the reputation of producing a good painter. So far indeed it is lucky, that the most valuable pictures are not loaded with a greater duty than the most execrable. Fish, both salt and fresh, brought to Paris, pay a duty of 48 *per cent.* by an arbitrary estimation of the value. This tax is an irreparable injury to France, by discouraging the multiplication of seamen. It is beneficial indeed in one view, as it tends to check the growing population of that great city.

Without waiting to rummage the British taxes for examples of the fourth kind, I shall present my reader with a foreign instance. In the Austrian Netherlands, there are inexhaustible mines of coal, the exportation of which would make a considerable article of commerce, were it not absolutely barred by an exorbitant duty. This absurd duty is a great injury to proprietors of coal, without yielding a farthing to the government. The Dutch many years ago offered to confine themselves to that country for coal, on condition of being relieved from the duty; which would have brought down the price below that of British coal. Is it not wonderful, that the proposal was rejected? But ministers seldom regard what is beneficial to the nation, unless it produce an immediate benefit to their sovereign or to themselves. The coal-mines in the Austrian Netherlands being thus shut up, and the art of working them lost, the British enjoy the monopoly of exporting coal to Holland.

The duty on coal water-born is an instance of the fifth kind. A great obstruction it is to many useful manufactures that require coal; and indeed to manufactures in general, by increasing the expence of coal, an essential article in a cold country. Nay, one would imagine, that it has been intended to check population; as poor wretches benumbed with cold, feel little of the carnal appetite. It has not even the merit of adding much to the public revenue;

venue; for, laying aside London, it produces but a mere trifle. But the peculiarity of this tax, which intitles it to a conspicuous place in the fifth class, is, that it is not less detrimental to the public revenue than to individuals. No sedentary art nor occupation, can succeed in a cold climate without plenty of fuel. One may at the first glance distinguish the coal-countries from the rest of England, by the industry of the inhabitants, and by plenty of manufacturing towns and villages. Where there is scarcity of fuel, some hours are lost every morning; because people cannot work till the place be sufficiently warmed, which is especially the case in manufactures that require a soft and delicate finger. Now, in many parts of Britain which might be provided with coal by water, the labouring poor are deprived of that comfort by the tax. Had cheap firing encouraged these people to prosecute arts and manufactures; it is more than probable, that at this day they would be contributing to the public revenue by other duties, much greater sums than are drawn from them by the duty on coal. At the same time, if coal must pay a duty, why not at the pit, where it is cheapest? Is it not an egregious blunder, to lay a great duty on those who pay a high price for coal, and no duty on those who have it cheap? If there must be a coal-duty, let water-borne coal at any rate be exempted; not only because even without duty it comes dear to the consumer, but also for the encouragement of seamen. For the honour of Britain this duty ought to be expunged from our statute-book, never again to show its face. Great reason indeed there is for continuing the duty on coal consumed in London; because every artifice should be put in practice, to prevent the increase of a head, that is already too large for the body, or for any body. Towns are unhealthy in proportion to their size; and a great town like London is a greater enemy to population than war or famine.

S E C T. VII.

REGULATIONS for advancing INDUSTRY and COMMERCE.

OF all sciences, that of politics is the most intricate; and its progress toward maturity is slow in proportion. In the present section, taxes on exportation of native commodities take the lead; and nothing can set in a stronger light the gross ignorance of former ages, than a maxim universally adopted, That to tax exportation, or to prohibit it altogether, is the best means for having plenty at home. In Scotland we were not satisfied with prohibiting the exportation of corn, of fish, and of horses: the prohibition was extended to manufactures, linen cloth, for example, candle, butter, cheese, barked hides, shoes * (a).

Duties on exportation are in great favour, from a notion that they are paid by foreigners. This holds sometimes, as in the above-mentioned case of coal exported to Holland: but it fails in every case where the foreign market can be supplied by others;

* Oil was the only commodity that by the laws of Solon was permitted to be exported from Attica. The figs of that country, which are delicious, came to be produced in such plenty, that there was no sufficient consumpt for them at home; and yet the law prohibiting exportation was not abrogated. Sycophant denotes a person who informs against the exporter of figs: but the prohibition appearing absurd, sycophant became a term of reproach.

(a) Act 59. parl. 1573.

for whatever be the duty, the merchant must regulate his price by the market. And even supposing the market-price at present to be sufficient for the duty, with a reasonable profit to the exporter, those who pay no duty will strain every nerve of rivalry, till they cut us out by low prices. The duty on French wine exported from France, is equal to a bounty to the wines of neighbouring countries. At the same time, the duty is unskilfully imposed, being the same upon all wines exported, without regard to flavour or strength; which bars the commerce of small wines, tho' much more plentiful. A moderate duty on exportation, such as small wines can bear, would add a greater sum to the revenue, and also be more beneficial to commerce. To improve the commerce of wine in France, the exportation ought to be free, or, at most, charged with a moderate duty *ad valorem*. In Spain an excessive duty is laid upon the plant barrile when exported; from a persuasion that it will not grow in any other country. It is not considered, that this tax, by lessening the demand, is a discouragement to its culture. A moderate duty would raise more money to the public, would employ more hands, and would make that plant a permanent article of commerce. The excessive duty has set invention at work, for some material in place of that plant. If such a material shall be discovered, the Spanish ministry will be convinced of a salutary maxim, That it is not always safe, to interrupt by high duties the free course of commerce. Formerly in Britain the exportation of manufactured copper was prohibited. That blunder in commercial politics, was corrected by a statute in the reign of King William, permitting such copper to be exported, on paying a duty of four shillings the hundred weight. The exportation ought to have been declared free; which was done by a statute of Queen Anne. But as people are apt to overdo in the rage of improvement, this statute permits even unwrought copper, a raw material, to be exported. This probably

was to favour copper-mines : but did it not also favour foreign copper-manufactures ? Goods and merchandise of the product or manufacture of Great Britain, may be exported duty free (a). Alum, lead, and some other commodities specified in the statute, are excepted ; and a duty formerly paid on exportation is continued, for encouraging such of our own manufactures as employ any of the articles specified. In Ireland to this day, goods exported are loaded with a high duty, without even distinguishing made work from raw materials ; corn, for example, fish, hops, butter, horned cattle, wrought iron, leather, and every thing made of it, &c. &c. And that nothing may escape, all goods exported that are not contained in the book of rates, pay 5 per cent. *ad valorem*.

When Sully entered on the administration of the French finances, the corn in France was at an exorbitant price, occasioned by neglect of husbandry during the civil war. That sagacious minister discovered the secret of re-establishing agriculture, and of reducing the price of corn, which is, to allow a free exportation. So rapid was the success of that bold but politic measure, that in a few years France became the granary of Europe ; and what at present may appear wonderful, we find in the English records, *anno* 1621, bitter complaints of the French underselling them in their own markets. Colbert, who, fortunately for us, had imbibed the common error, renewed the ancient prohibition of exporting corn, hoping to have it cheap at home for his manufacturers. But he was in a gross mistake ; for that prohibition has been the chief cause of many famines in France since that time. The corn-trade in France lay long under great discouragements ; and the French ministry continued long blind to the interest of their country. At last edicts were issued, authorising the commerce of corn to be absolutely free, whether sold within the kingdom or

(a) George I. cap. 14. act 8.

exported.

exported. The generality however continued blind. In the year 1768, the badness of the harvest having occasioned a famine, the distresses of the people were excessive, and their complaints universal. Overlooking altogether the bad harvest, they, from amazing partiality, attributed their misery to the new law. It was in vain inculcated, that freedom in the corn-trade encourages agriculture; the popular opinion was adopted even by most of the parliaments; so difficult it is to eradicate established prejudices. In Turkey, about thirty years ago, a grand vizir permitted corn to be exported more freely than had been done formerly, a bushel of wheat being sold at that time under seventeen pence. Every nation flocked to Turkey for corn; and in particular no fewer than three hundred French vessels, from twenty to two hundred tons, entered Smyrna bay in one day. The Janissaries and populace took the alarm, fearing that all the corn would be exported, and that a famine would ensue. In Constantinople they grew mutinous, and could not be appeased till the vizir was strangled, and his body thrown out to them. His successor, who resolved not to split on the same rock, prohibited exportation absolutely. In that country, rent is paid in proportion to the product; and the farmers, who saw no demand, neglected tillage. In less than three years the bushel of wheat rose to six shillings; and the distresses of the people became intolerable. To this day, the fate of the good vizir is lamented.

We have improved upon Sully's discovery, by a bounty on corn exported, which has answered our most sanguine expectations. A great increase of gold and silver subsequent to the said bounty, which has raised the price of many other commodities, must have also raised that of corn, had not still a greater increase of corn, occasioned by the bounty, reduced its price even below what it was formerly; and by that means our manufactures have profited by the bounty no less than our husbandry. The bounty is still

more important in another respect: agriculture in France lies under many discouragements; the greatest of which is, that our wheat can be afforded as cheap in their markets as their own; and by prohibiting exportation, it is in our power during a war, to dash all the French schemes for conquest, by depriving them of bread*. This bounty therefore is our palladium, which we ought religiously to guard, if we would avoid being a province of France. Some sage politicians have begun of late to mutter against the bounty, as feeding our rival manufacturers cheaper than our own; which is a mistake, for the expence of exportation commonly equals the bounty. But supposing it true, will the evil be remedied by withdrawing the bounty? On the contrary, it will discourage manufactures, by raising the price of wheat at home. It will beside encourage French husbandry, so as in all probability to reduce the price of their wheat, below what we afford it to them. In France, labour is cheaper than in England, the people are more frugal, they possess a better soil and climate: what have we to balance these signal advantages but our bounty? and were that bounty withdrawn, I should not be surpris'd to see French corn poured in upon us, at a lower price than it can be furnished at home; the very game that was play'd against us, during Sully's administration.

The exportation of British manufactures to our American colonies, ought to meet with such encouragement as to prevent them from rivalling us: it would be a gross blunder to encourage their manufactures, by imposing a duty on what we export to them.

* Between the years 1715 and 1755 there was of wheat exported from England into France twenty-one millions of *septiers*, estimated at two hundred millions of livres. The bounty for exporting corn has sometimes amounted to L. 150,000 for a single year. But this sum is not all lost to the public; for frequently our corn is exchanged with goods that pay a high duty on importation.

We ought rather to give a bounty on exportation ; which, by underfelling them in their own markets, would quash every attempt to rivalship.

As the duty on foreign linen imported into Britain, is drawn back when exported to America, our legislature gave a bounty on our coarse linen exported to that country, which enables us to cope with the Germans in the American markets. The staining or printing of linen cloth, has of late become a considerable article in the manufactures of Britain ; and there is no sort of linen more proper for that manufacture than our own. The duty of foreign linen is drawn back when exported to America, whether plain or stamped : and as we lose the bounty on our coarse linen when stamped, none but foreign linen is employ'd in the stamping manufacture. This is an oversight such as our legislature is guilty of sometimes.

It is not always true policy, to discourage the exportation of our own rude materials : liberty of exportation, gives encouragement to produce them in greater plenty at home ; which consequently lowers the price to our manufacturers. Upon that principle, the exporting corn is permitted, and in Britain even encouraged with a bounty. But where exportation of a rude material will not encrease its quantity, the prohibition is good policy. For example, the exporting of rags for paper may be prohibited ; because liberty of exporting will not occasion one yard more of linen cloth to be consumed.

Lyons is the city of Europe where the greatest quantity of silk stuffs is made : it is at the same time the greatest staple of raw silk ; the silk of Italy, of Spain, of the Levant, and of the south of France, being there collected. The exportation of raw silk is prohibited in France, with a view to lessen its price at home, and to obstruct the silk-manufacture among foreigners. The first is a gross error ; the prohibition of exportation producing scarcity, not
plenty :

plenty: and with respect to the other view, it seems to have been overlooked, that the commerce of the silks of Italy, of Spain, and of the Levant, is not confined to France, but is open to all trading nations. This prohibition is indeed so injudicious, that without any benefit to France, it has done irreparable mischief to the city of Lyons: while the commerce of raw silk, both buying and selling, was monopoliz'd by the merchants of that city, they had it in their power to regulate the price; but to compel foreigners to go to the fountain-head, not only raises the price by concurrence of purchasers, but deprives Lyons of a lucrative monopoly. The same blunder is repeated with respect to raw silk spun and dy'd. In Lyons, silk is prepared for the loom with more art than any where else; and to secure the silk-manufacture, the exportation of spun silk is prohibited; which must rouse foreigners, to bestow their utmost attention upon improving the spinning and dressing of silk: and who knows whether reiterated trials by persons of genius, may not, in England for example, bring these branches of the manufacture to greater perfection, than they are even in Lyons?

Whether we have not committed a blunder of the same kind in prohibiting exportation of our wool, is a very serious question, which I proceed to examine. A spirit for husbandry, and for every sort of improvement, is in France turning more and more general. In several provinces there are societies, who have command of public money for promoting agriculture; and about no other article are these societies more solicitous, than about improving the staple of their wool. A book lately published in Sweden, and translated into French, has inspired them with sanguine hopes of success; as it contains an account of the Swedish wool being greatly improved in quality, as well as in quantity, by importing Spanish and English sheep for breed. Now as France is an extensive country, situated between Spain and England, two excellent wool-

wool-countries, it would be strange, if there should not be found a single corner in all France, where wool may be advanced to some degree of perfection. Britain may be justly apprehensive of these attempts; for if France can cope with us under the disadvantage of procuring our wool by smuggling, how far will they exceed us with good wool of their own? The woollen cloth of England has always been held its capital manufacture; and patriotism calls on every one to prevent if possible the loss of that valuable branch. Till something better be discovered, I venture to propose what at first may be thought a strange measure, and that is, to permit the exportation of our wool upon a moderate duty, such as will raise the price to the French, but not such as to encourage smuggling. The opportunity of procuring wool in the neighbourhood at a moderate price, joined with several unsuccessful attempts to improve the staple of their own wool, would soon make the French abandon thoughts of that improvement.

Experience has unfolded the advantages of liberty to export corn: it has greatly encouraged agriculture, and, by increasing the quantity of corn, has made it even cheaper at home than formerly. Have we not reason to expect a similar consequence, from the same measure with respect to wool? A new vent for that commodity, would increase the number of our sheep, meliorate the land by their dung, and probably bring down the price of our wool at home. It is proper indeed to prohibit the exportation of wool, as of corn, when the price rises above a certain sum; which would have the double effect of securing plenty to ourselves, and distressing our rivals at critical times when the commodity is scarce.

There is one reason that should influence our legislature to permit the exportation of wool, even supposing the foregoing arguments to be inconclusive: Very long experience may teach us, if we can be taught by experience, that vain are our endeavours to
prevent

prevent wool from being exported: it holds true with respect to all prohibitions, that smuggling will always prevail, where the profits rise above the risk. Why not then make a virtue of necessity, by permitting exportation under a duty? One other measure would restore the English woollen manufacture to its pristine splendor, which is, to apply the sum arising from the tax, as a premium for exporting woollen goods. Were that measure adopted, the liberty of exporting wool would prove a singular blessing to England.

I close this branch with a commercial lesson, to which every other consideration ought to yield. The trade of a nation depends for the most part on very delicate circumstances, and requires to be carefully nursed. Foreigners, in particular, ought to be flattered and encouraged, that they may prefer us before others. Nor ought we ever to rely entirely on our natural advantages; for it is not easy to foresee what may occur to overbalance them. As this reflection is no less obvious than weighty, facts will be more effectual than argument for making a deep impression. The Swiss some years ago imported all their wines from the King of Sardinia's dominions. The King laid a high duty on these wines, knowing that the Swiss had not ready access to any other wine-country. He did not foresee, that this high duty was equal to a premium for cultivating the vine at home. They succeeded; and now are provided with wine of their own growth. The city of Lyons, by making silver-thread in perfection, had maintained a monopoly of that article against foreigners, as well as natives. But a high duty on the exporting it, in order to monopolize also the manufacture of silver-lace, will probably excite foreigners to improve their own silver-thread and silver-lace; and France will be deprived of both monopolies, by the very means employ'd for securing both. English goods purchased by Spaniards for the American market, pay to the King of Spain on exportation

portation a duty equal to their value. This impolitic measure opens a wide door to smuggling; as English goods can be furnished *50 per cent.* cheaper from Jamaica. The Spanish governor of Mexico joins underhand in the smuggling; which is commonly carried on in the following manner. The governor, to whom early notice is given, issues a proclamation, bearing, that a foreign ship, with English goods on board, every article being specified, is hovering on the coast; and prohibiting, under severe penalties, any person to be a purchaser. That public proclamation, which is virtually a public advertisement, has the desired effect. All flock to the shore, and purchase in perfect tranquillity.

Beside heavy duties, commerce with foreigners has been distressed by many unwary regulations. The herring-fishery, which is now an immense article of commerce, was engrossed originally by the Scots. But grasping at all advantages, the royal boroughs of Scotland, in the reign of the second James, prohibited their fishermen to sell herrings at sea to foreigners; ordering, that the herring should be first landed, in order that they themselves might be first served. Such was the police of those times. But behold the consequence. The Netherlanders, and people of the Hanse towns, being prohibited to purchase as formerly, became fishers themselves, and cut the Scots out of that profitable branch of trade. The tar-company of Sweden, taking it for granted, that the English could not otherwise be supplied, refused to let them have any pitch or tar, even for ready money, unless permitted to be imported into England in Swedish bottoms; and consequently in such quantities only as the company should be pleased to furnish. This hardship moved the parliament to give a bounty for pitch and tar made in our own colonies. And if we be not already, we shall soon be altogether independent of Sweden. The Dutch, excited by the profitable trade of Portugal with the East Indies, attempted a north-east passage to China;

and that proving abortive, they set on foot a trade with Lisbon for East-India commodities. Portugal was at that time subject to the King of Spain; and the Dutch, tho' at war with Spain, did not doubt of their being well received in Portugal, with which kingdom they had no cause of quarrel. But the King of Spain, overlooking not only the law of nations, but even his own interest as King of Portugal, confiscated at short-hand the Dutch ships and their cargoes, in the harbour of Lisbon. That unjust and unpolitic treatment, provoked the Dutch to attempt an East-India trade, which probably they would not otherwise have thought of; and they were so successful, as to supplant the Portuguese in every quarter. And thus the King of Spain, by a gross error in politics, exalted his enemies to be a powerful maritime state. Had he encouraged the Dutch to trade with Lisbon, other nations must have resorted to the same market. Portugal thereby would have been raised to such a height of maritime power, as to be afraid of no rival. The Dutch would not have thought of coping with them, nor would any other nation.

We proceed to foreign commodities, and the measures laid down for regulating their importation, which have different views. One is, to keep down a rival power; in which view it is prudent to prohibit importation from one country, and to encourage it from another. It is judicious in the British legislature, to load French wines with a higher duty than those of Portugal; and in France, it would be a proper measure, to prefer the beef of Holstein, or of Russia, before that of Ireland; and the tobacco of the Ukraine, or of the Palatinate, before that of Virginia. But such measures of government ought to be sparingly exercised, for fear of retaliation.

There is no cause more cogent for regulating importation, than an unfavourable balance. By permitting French goods to be imported free of duty, the balance against England was computed to be

be a million Sterling yearly. In the year 1678, that importation was regulated; which, with a prohibition of wearing East-India manufactures, did in twenty years turn the balance of trade in favour of England.

Most of the British regulations with regard to goods imported, are contrived for promoting our own manufactures, or those of our colonies. A statute, 3^d Edward IV. cap. 4. intitled, "Certain merchandises not lawful to be brought ready wrought into the kingdom," contains a large list of such merchandises; showing the good sense of the English in an early period, intent on promoting their own manufactures. To favour a new manufacture of our own, it is proper to lay a duty on the same manufacture imported. To encourage the art of throwing silk, the duty on raw silk imported is reduced, and that on thrown silk is heightened. But such a measure ought to be taken with great circumspection, lest it recoil against ourselves. The Swedes, some years ago, intent on raising manufactures at home, prohibited at once foreign manufactures, without due preparation. Smuggling ensued, for people must import what they cannot find at home; and the home manufactures were not benefited. But the consequences were still more severe. Foreign manufactures were formerly purchased with their copper, iron, timber, pitch, tar, &c.: but now, as foreigners cannot procure these commodities but with ready money, they resort to Russia and Norway, where commodities of the same kind are procured by barter. The Swedish government, perceiving their error, permit several foreign manufactures to be imported as formerly. But it is now too late; for the trade flows into another channel; and at present, the Swedish copper and iron works are far from flourishing as they once did. In the year 1768, an ordinance was issued by the court of Spain, prohibiting printed or painted linen and cotton to be imported; intended for encouraging a manufacture of printed cottons pro-

jected in Catalonia and Aragon. The Spanish ministry have all along been singularly unlucky in their commercial regulations. It is easy to foresee, that such a prohibition will have no effect, but to raise the price on the subjects of Spain; for the prohibited goods will be smuggled, discouraging as much as ever the intended manufacture. The prudent measure would have been, to lay a duty upon printed cottons and linens imported, so small as not to encourage smuggling; and to apply that duty for nursing the infant manufacture. A foreign manufacture ought never to be totally prohibited, till that at home be in such plenty, as nearly to supply the wants of the natives. During ignorance of political principles, a new manufacture was commonly encouraged with an exclusive privilege for a certain number of years. Thus in Scotland, an exclusive privilege of exporting woollen and linen manufactures, was given to some private societies (a). Such a monopoly is ruinous to a nation; and frequently to the manufacture itself (b). I know no monopoly that in sound politics can be justified, except that given to authors of books for fourteen years by an act of Queen Anne *. Exemption from duty, premiums

(a) Act 42. parl. 1661.

(b) See *Elémens du Commerce*, tom. 1. p. 334.

* That act is judiciously contrived, not only for the benefit of authors, but for that of learning in general. It encourages men of genius to write, and multiplies books both of instruction and amusement; which, by concurrence of many editors after the monopoly is at an end, are sold at the cheapest rate. Many well-disposed persons complain, that the exclusive privilege bestow'd by the statute upon authors is too short, and that it ought to be perpetual. Nay it is asserted, that authors have a perpetual privilege by common law; and it was determined lately in the court of king's-bench, that by the common law of England the privilege is perpetual. Nothing more frequently happens, than by grasping at the shadow, to lose the substance; for I have no difficulty to maintain, that a perpetual mono-

to the best workmen, a bounty on exportation, joined with a duty on goods of the same kind imported, and at last a total prohibition, are the proper encouragements to a new manufacture.

The importation of raw materials ought to be encouraged in every manufacturing country, permitting only a moderate duty for encouraging our own rude materials of the same kind. By a French edict 1654, for encouraging ship-building, ship-timber imported pays no duty. But perhaps a moderate duty would have been better policy, in order to encourage such timber of the growth of France. Deal timber accordingly, and other timber, imported into Britain from any part of Europe, Ireland excepted, pays a moderate duty. And oak-bark imported pays a duty, which is an encouragement to propagate oak at home. The importation of lean cattle from Ireland, which in effect are raw ma-

poly of books would prove more destructive to learning, and even to authors, than a second irruption of Goths and Vandals. It is the nature of a monopoly to raise the price of commodities; and by a perpetual monopoly in the commerce of books, the price of good books would be raised far beyond the reach of most readers; they would be sold like pictures of the great masters. The works of Shakespeare, for example, or of Milton, would be seen in very few libraries. In short, the sale of good books would be confined to a few learned men, such as have money to spare, and to a few rich men, who buy out of vanity, as they buy a diamond or a fine coat. Fashions at the same time are variable; and books, even the most splendid, would wear out of fashion with men of opulence, and be despised as antiquated furniture. And with respect to men of taste, their number is so small as not to afford encouragement even for the most frugal edition. Thus booksellers, by grasping too much, would put an end to their trade altogether; and men of genius would not write, when no price could be afforded for their works. At the same time, our present authors and booksellers would not be much benefited by such a monopoly. Not many books have so long a run as fourteen years; and the success of a book on the first publication, is so uncertain, that a bookseller will give little more for a perpetuity, than for the temporary privilege of the statute. This was foreseen by the legislature; and the privilege was wisely confined to fourteen years, equally beneficial to the public and to authors.

terials,

terials, is, by a statute of Charles II. declared a public nuisance. What gross ignorance! Is it not evident, that to feed cattle, is more profitable than to breed them? The chief promoter of that notable statute, was Sir John Knight, infamous for an insolent speech in King William's reign against naturalizing foreign Protestants, and proposing to kick out of the kingdom those already settled. Experience hath proved the benefit of importing lean cattle into England; witness the vast quantities imported yearly from Scotland. Diamonds, pearls, and jewels of every kind, paid formerly upon importation a duty of ten *per cent. ad valorem*; which by act 6^o George II. cap. 7. was taken off, upon the following preamble: "That London is now become a great mart for diamonds and other precious stones, from whence most foreign countries are supplied; that great numbers of rough diamonds are sent here to be cut and polished; and that a free importation would encrease the trade."

Sorry am I to observe, that several of our duties on importation, are far from being conformable to the foregoing rule; many raw materials necessary for our manufactures being loaded with a duty on importation, and some with a heavy duty. Barilla, for example, is a raw material used in the glass-manufacture: the exportation from Spain is loaded with a very high duty: and to raise the price still higher, we add another duty on importation; without having the pretext of encouraging a raw material of our own growth, for barilla grows not in this island. Hair is a raw material employ'd in several manufactures; and yet every kind of it, human hair, horse hair, goat's hair, &c. pays a duty on importation; which consequently raises the price of our own hair, as well as of what is imported. Nor has this duty, more than the former, the pretext of being an encouragement to our own product; for surely there will not on that account be reared one child more, or foal, or kid. The same objection lies against the duty

ty on foreign kelp, which is very high. Rancid oil of olives, fit for soap and woollen manufactures, pays upon importation a high duty: were it free of duty, we should be able to serve ourselves with Castile soap of home manufacture; and likewise our colonies, which are partly supplied by the French. Each of the following raw materials ought in sound policy to be free of duty on importation; and yet they are loaded with a duty, some with a high duty; pot-ashes, elephant's teeth, raw silk from the East Indies, lamp-black, bristles dressed or undressed, horns of beeves. Undressed skins, tho' a rude material, pay a duty on importation; and French kid-skins are honoured above others with a high duty: to reject a great benefit to ourselves rather than afford a small benefit to a rival nation, favours more of peevishness than of prudence.

For encouraging our colonies, coffee is permitted to be imported from the plantations free of duty, while other coffee pays six pence *per* pound. The heavy duty on whalebone and whale-oil imported, which was laid on for encouraging our own whaling, is taken off with respect to the importation from our American colonies (a). This may put an end to our own whaling, but it will enable the Americans to cope with the Dutch; and who knows whether they may not at last prevail? For encouraging the culture of hemp and flax in America, there is a bounty given upon what is imported into Britain. One would imagine, that our legislature intended to enable the colonies to rival us in a staple manufacture, contrary to the fundamental principle of colonization. But we did not see so far: we only foresaw a benefit to Britain, in being supplied with hemp and flax from our colonies, rather than from Russia and the Low Countries. But even abstracting from rivalry, was it not obvious, that a bounty for

(a) 4^o George III. cap. 29.

encouraging the culture of hemp and flax at home, would be more successful, than for encouraging the culture in America, where the price of labour is excessively high, not to talk of the freight *†

The encouragement given to foreign linen-yarn, by taking off the duty on importation, is a measure that greatly concerns Britain; and how far salutary, shall be strictly examined, after stating some preliminary observations. The first is, That as the price of our own commodities can never rise above that of foreign commodities sold here, the price of imported linen must regulate the price of home-made linen. The next is, That tho' the duty on importation is paid by the merchant at the first instance, he relieves himself of it, by raising the price on the purchaser; which of course raises the price of the same sort of goods made at home;

* Between the mother-country and her colonies the following rule ought to be sacred, That with respect to commodities wanted, each of them should prefer the other before all other nations. Britain should take from her colonies whatever they can furnish for her use; and they should take from Britain whatever she can furnish for their use. In a word, every thing regarding commerce ought to be reciprocal, and equal between them. To bar a colony from access to the fountain-head for commodities that cannot be furnished by the mother-country but at second-hand, is oppression: it is so far degrading the colonists from being free subjects to be slaves. What right, for example, has Britain to prohibit her colonies from purchasing tea or porcelain at Canton, if they can procure it cheaper there than in London? No connection between two nations can be so intimate, as to make such restraint an act of justice. Our legislature however have acted like a stepmother to her American colonies, by prohibiting them to have any commerce but with Britain only. They must land first in Britain all their commodities, even what are not intended to be sold there; and they must take from Britain, not only its own product, but every foreign commodity that is wanted. This regulation is not only unjust but impolitic; as by it the interest of the colonies in general is sacrificed to that of a few London merchants. Our legislature have at last so far opened their eyes, as to give a partial relief. Some articles are permitted to be carried directly to the place of destination, without being first entered in Britain, wheat for example, rice, &c.

and

and accordingly a duty on importation is in effect a bounty to our own manufacturers. A third observation is, That the price of our linen-cloth ought to be divided between the spinner and the weaver, in such proportion as to afford bread to both. If the yarn be too high, the weaver is undone; and if too low, the spinner is undone. This was not attended to, when, for encouraging our spinners, a duty of three pence was laid on every pound of imported linen-yarn; which had the effect to raise the price of our own yarn beyond what the weaver could afford. This mystery being unvailed, the duty was first lowered to two pence, and then to a penny: our spinners had tolerable bread, and our weavers were not oppressed with paying too high a price for yarn.

Some patriotic gentlemen, who had more zeal than knowledge, finding the linen-manufacture benefited by the several reductions of the duty, rashly concluded, that it would be still more benefited by a total abolition of the duty. The penny accordingly was taken off (*a*), and linen-yarn was permitted to be imported duty-free; which, if matters had continued as at the date of the act, would have left us not a single spinner by profession; because it would have reduced the price of our yarn below what could afford bread to the spinner. Lucky it has been for our linen-manufacture, that the German war, which soon followed, suspended all their manufactures, and spinning in particular; which proved a favourable opportunity for diffusing widely the art of spinning, and for making our spinners more and more dexterous. And yet, now that the war is at an end, it is far from being certain, that our yarn can be afforded as cheap as what is imported from Silesia. We have good authority for asserting, that the English spinners have suffered by that statute: from the books of many parishes it appears, that soon after the statute, a number of wo-

(*a*) 29^o George II.

men, who had lived by spinning, became a burden upon the parish. One thing is evident, that as spinning is the occupation of females who cannot otherwise be so usefully employ'd, and as more hands are required for spinning than for weaving, the former is the more valuable branch of the manufacture. It ought then to be the peculiar concern of our legislature, not to destroy that branch by impolitic regulations. And yet very little attention seems to have been given to the public interest, in passing the act under consideration. Why was it not enquired into, whether the intended reduction of the price of yarn, would leave bread to the British spinner? The result of that enquiry would have been fatal to the intended act; for it would have been clearly seen, that the Scotch spinner could not make bread by her work, far less the English. Other particulars ought also to have been suggested to the legislature, that flax-spinning is of all occupations the fittest for women of a certain class, confined within small houses; that a flax-wheel requires less space than a wheel for wool; and that the toughness of British flax makes it excel for sail-cloth, dowlas, ticking, and sheeting. The British spinner might, in a British statute, have expected the cast of the scale, had it been but a halfpenny *per* pound on importation.

At the same time, why should there be any inconsistency in our commercial regulations, when the wisest heads of the nation are employ'd about them? Flax rough or undressed, being a rude material, is imported duty-free, but dressed flax pays a high duty; both of them calculated for encouraging our own manufacturers. Behold now a flat inconsistency: tho' dressed flax, for the reason given, pays a high duty; yet when by additional labour it is converted into yarn, it pays no duty. How absurd is this! Further, foreign yarn is not only made welcome duty-free, but even receives a bounty when converted into linen, and exported to our plantations. Have we no reason to be afraid, that such indulgence

gence to foreign yarn will deprive us of foreign rough flax? The difference of bulk and freight will determine the Germans to send us nothing but their yarn, and equally determine our importers to commission that commodity only.

Goods imported, if subjected to a duty, are generally of the best kind; because the duty bears a less proportion to such than to meaner sorts. The best French wines are imported into Britain, where the duty is higher than in any other country. For that reason, the best linen-yarn was imported while the duty subsisted; but now the German yarn is sorted into different kinds, of which the worst is reserved for the English market.

Regulations concerning the exportation of commodities formerly imported, come next in order. And for encouraging such exportation, one method practised with success, is, to restore to the merchant the whole or part of the duty paid at importation; which is termed a *drawback*. This in particular is done with respect to tobacco; which by that means can be afforded to foreigners at two pence halfpenny *per* pound, when the price at home is eight pence halfpenny. But by an omission in the act of parliament, a drawback is only given for raw tobacco; which bars the exportation of snuff or manufactured tobacco, as foreigners can undersell us five-and-thirty *per cent*. Tobacco being an article of luxury, it was well judged in our legislature to lay a heavier duty on what is consumed at home, than on what is exported. Upon the same principle, the duty that is paid on the importation of coffee and cocoa from our American plantations, is wholly drawn back when exported (a). But as China earthen ware is not intitled to any encouragement from us, and as it is an article of luxury, it gets no drawback, even when exported to America (7^o George III. cap. 46.). The exporter of rice from Britain, first imported from

(a) 7^o George III. cap. 46.

America, is intitled to draw back but half the duty paid on importation. Rice imported duty-free might rival our wheat-crop. But the whole duty ought to be drawn back on exportation: it ought to be afforded to our neighbours at the lowest rate, partly to rival their wheat-crop, and partly to encourage our rice-colonies.

Tobacco is an article of luxury; and it is well ordered, that it should come dearer to us than to foreigners. But every wise administration will take the opposite side with respect to articles that concern our manufactures. Quicksilver pays upon importation a duty of about 8d. *per* pound; 7d. of which is drawn back upon exportation. The intention of the drawback was to encourage the commerce of quicksilver; without adverting, that to afford quicksilver to foreign manufacturers cheaper than to our own, is a gross blunder in commercial politics. Again, when quicksilver is manufactured into vermilion or sublimite, no drawback is allowed; which effectually bars their exportation: we ought to be ashamed of such an absurdity. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, dyers were prohibited to use logwood, which was ordered to be openly burnt. But the English dyers having acquired the art of fixing colours made of logwood, it was permitted to be imported (a), every ton paying on importation L. 5; L. 4 of which was to be drawn back upon exportation. That law, made in the days of ignorance, was intended to encourage the commerce of logwood; and had that effect: but the blunder of discouraging our own manufactures, by furnishing logwood cheaper to our rivals, was overlooked. Both articles were put upon a better footing (b), giving a greater encouragement to the commerce of logwood, by allowing it to be imported duty-free; and

(a) Act 13. & 14. Charles II. cap. 11. § 26. 27.

(b) Act 8^o George I. c. 14.

by giving an advantage to our own manufactures, by laying a duty of 40s. upon every hundred weight exported. Lastly, Still more to encourage the commerce of logwood (a), the duty upon exportation is discontinued. It will have the effect proposed: but will not that benefit be more than balanced by the encouragement it gives to foreign manufactures? By the late peace, we have obtained the monopoly of gum-senega; and proper measures have been taken for turning it to the best account: the exportation from Africa is confined to Great Britain; and the duty on importation is only six pence *per* hundred weight: but the duty on exportation from Britain is thirty shillings *per* hundred weight (b); which, with freight, commission, and insurance, makes it come dear to foreigners. Formerly, every beaver's skin paid upon importation seven pence of duty; and the exporter received a drawback of four pence; as if it had been the purpose of the legislature, to make our own people pay more for that useful commodity than foreigners. Upon obtaining a monopoly of beaver-skins by the late peace, that absurd regulation was altered: a penny *per* skin of duty is laid on importation, and seven pence on exportation (c). By that means beaver-skins are cheaper here than in any other country of Europe. A similar regulation is established with respect to gum-arabic. A hundred weight pays on importation six pence, and on exportation L. 1, 10s. (d). As the foregoing articles are used in various manufactures, their cheapness in Britain, by means of these regulations, will probably balance the high price of labour, so as to keep open to us the foreign market.

(a) 7^o Geo. III. cap. 47.

(b) 5^o George III. cap. 37.

(c) 4^o George III. cap. 9.

(d) 5^o George III. cap. 37.

James I. of England issued a proclamation, prohibiting gold and silver, whether in coin or plate, goldsmith's work, or bullion, to be exported. Not to mention the unconstitutional step of an English King usurping the legislative power, it was a glaring absurdity to prohibit manufactured work from being exported. Gold and silver, coined or uncoined, are to this day prohibited to be exported from France; a most absurd prohibition, for a merchant will never willingly export gold and silver; but if the balance be against him, the exportation is unavoidable. The only effect of the prohibition is, to swell the merchant's debt; for he must have recourse to a smuggler, who must be tempted with a high bribe to undertake the exportation.

A French author remarks, that in no country are commercial regulations better contrived than in Britain; and instances the following particulars. 1st, Foreign commodities, such as may rival their own, are prohibited, or burdened with duties. 2d, Their manufactures are encouraged by a free exportation. 3d, Raw materials which cannot be produced at home, cochineal, for example, indigo, &c. are imported free of duty. 4th, Raw materials of their own growth, such as wool, fuller's earth, &c. are prohibited to be exported. 5th, Every commodity has a free course through the kingdom, without duty. And lastly, Duties paid on importation, are repaid on exportation. This remark is for the most part well founded: and yet the facts above set forth will not permit us to say, that the English commercial laws have as yet arrived at perfection.

HAVING thus gone through the several articles that enter into the present sketch, I shall close with some general reflections. The management of the finances is a most important branch of government; and no less delicate than important. Taxes may be so contrived as to promote in a high degree the prosperity of a state; and without much contrivance, they may do much mischief.

chief. The latter, by rendering the sovereign odious, and the people miserable, effectually eradicate patriotism: no other cause is more fruitful of rebellion; and no other cause reduces a country to be a more easy prey to an invader. To that cause were the Mahometans chiefly indebted for their conquest of the Greek empire. The people were glad to change their master; because, instead of multiplied, intricate, and vexatious duties, they found themselves subjected to a simple tribute, easily collected, and easily paid. Had the art of oppressive taxes been known to the Romans, when they put in practice against the Carthaginians the utmost perfidy and cruelty for making them abandon their city, they probably would have chosen the softer method of imposing high duties on exportation and importation, which would have gratified their avarice, and at the same time have emaciated Carthage, and reduced it to beggary.

But such taxes require not the aid of external force to subdue a nation: they alone will reduce it to the most contemptible weakness. From the union of the different Spanish kingdoms under one monarch, there was reason to expect an exertion of spirit, similar to that of the Romans when peace was restored under Augustus. Spain was at that period the most potent kingdom in Europe, or perhaps in the world; and yet, instead of flourishing in that advantageous condition, it was by noxious taxes brought down to poverty and depopulation. The political history of that kingdom with respect to its finances, ought to be kept in perpetual remembrance, that kings, and their ministers, may shun the destructive rock upon which Spain hath been wrecked. The cortes of Spain had once as extensive powers as ever were enjoy'd by an English parliament; but at the time of the union their power being sunk to a shadow, the King and his ministers governed without much control. Britain cannot be too thankful to Providence for her parliament. From the history of every modern European nation,

tion, an instructive lesson may be gathered, that the three estates, or a parliament in our language, are the only proper check against the ignorance and rapacity of ministers. The fertility of the Spanish soil is well known. Notwithstanding frequent droughts to which it is liable, it would produce greatly with diligent culture; and in fact during the time of the Roman domination, produced corn sufficient for its numerous inhabitants, and a great surplus, which was annually exported to Italy. During the domination of the Moors, Arabian authors agree, that Spain was extremely populous. An author of that nation, who wrote in the tenth century, reports, that in his time there were in Spain 80 capital cities, 300 of the second and third orders, beside villages so frequent, that one could not walk a mile without meeting one or more of them. In Cordova alone, the capital of the Moorish empire, he reckons 200,000 houses *, 600 mosques, and 900 public baths. In the eleventh century, another author mentions no fewer than 12,000 villages in the plain of Seville. Agriculture at that period must have been in the utmost perfection, when Spain could feed such multitudes. What was the extent of their internal commerce, is not recorded; but all authors agree, that their foreign commerce was immense. Beside many articles of smaller value, they exported raw silk, oil, sugar, a sort of cochineal, quicksilver, iron wrought and unwrought, manufactures of silk, of wool, &c. The annual revenue of Abdoulrahman III. one of the Spanish califs, was in money 12,045,000 dinars, above five millions Sterling, beside large quantities of corn, wine, oil, and other fruits. That prince's revenue must indeed have been immense to supply the sums expended by him. Beside the annual charges of government, fleets, and armies, he laid out great sums on his pri-

* Dwelling-houses at that time were not so large, nor so expensive, as they came to be in later times.

vate pleasures. Tho' engaged continually in war, he had money to spare for building a new town three miles from Cordova, named *Zebra*, after his favourite mistress. In that town he erected a magnificent palace, sufficiently capacious for his whole seraglio of 6300 persons. There were in it 1400 columns of African and Spanish marble, 19 of Italian marble, and 140 of the finest kind, a present from the Greek Emperor. In the middle of the great saloon, were many images of birds and beasts in pure gold adorned with precious stones, pouring water into a large marble basin. That prince must have had immense stables for horses, when he entertained for his constant guard no fewer than 12,000 horsemen, having sabres and belts enriched with gold. Upon the city of Zehra alone, including the palace and gardens, were expended annually 300,000 dinars, which make above L. 100,000 Sterling; and it required twenty-five years to complete these works *.

The great fertility of the soil, the industry of the Moors, and their advantageous situation for trade, carried on the prosperity of Spain down to the time that they were subdued by Ferdinand

* A present made to Abdoulrahman by Abdoulmelik, when chosen prime vizier, is a specimen of the riches of Spain in that period. 1st, 408 pounds of virgin gold. 2d, The value of 420,000 sequins in silver ingots. 3d, 400 pounds of the wood of aloes, one piece of which weigh'd 180 pounds. 4th, 500 ounces of ambergrease, of which there was one piece that weigh'd 100 ounces. 5th, 300 ounces of the finest camphire. 6th, 300 pieces of gold-stuff, such as were prohibited to be worn but by the Caliph himself. 7th, A quantity of fine fur. 8th, Horse-furniture of gold and silk, Bagdad fabric, for 48 horses. 9th, 4000 pounds of raw silk. 10th, 30 pieces Persian tapestry of surprising beauty. 11th, Complete armour for 800 war-horses. 12th, 1000 bucklers, and 100,000 arrows. 13th, Fifteen Arabian horses, with most sumptuous furniture; and a hundred other Arabian horses for the King's attendants. 14th, Twenty mules, with suitable furniture. 15th, Forty young men, and twenty young women, complete beauties, all of them dress'd in superb habits.

of Arragon. Of this we have undoubted evidence, from the condition of Spain in the days of Charles V. and of his son Philip, being esteemed at that period the richest nation in the universe. We have the authority of Ustariz, that the town of Seville, in the period mentioned, contained 60,000 silk looms. During the sixteenth century, the woollen cloth of Segovia was esteemed the finest in Europe; and that of Catalonia long maintained its preference in the Levant, in Italy, and in the adjacent islands. In a memorial addressed to the second Philip, Louis Valle de la Cerda reports, that in the fair of Medina he had negotiated bills of exchange to the extent of one hundred and fifty-five millions of crowns; and in Spain at that time there were several other fairs, no less frequented.

The expulsion of the Moors, deprived Spain of six or seven hundred thousand frugal and industrious inhabitants; a wound that touch'd its vitals, but not mortal: tender care, with proper remedies, would have restored Spain to its former vigour. But unhappily for that kingdom, its political physicians were not skilled in the method of cure: instead of applying healing medicines, they enflamed the disease, and rendered it incurable. The ministry, who, instigated by the clergy, had prevailed on the King to banish the Moors, dreading loss of favour if they should suffer the King's revenues to sink, were forc'd, in self-defence, to double the taxes upon the remaining inhabitants. And what could be expected from that fatal measure, but utter ruin; when the poor Christians, who were too much of gentlemen to be industrious, had scarce been able to crawl under the load of former taxes?

But a matter that affords a lesson so instructive, merits a more particular detail. So late as the beginning of the last century, there were extensive plantations of sugar in the kingdom of Granada, which upon the occasion mentioned were deeply taxed, so as that with the former taxes sugar pay'd 36 *per cent.* This branch
of

of husbandry, which could not fail to languish under such oppression, was in a deep consumption when the first American sugars were imported into Europe, and was totally extinguished by the lower price of these sugars. Spain once enjoy'd a most extensive commerce of spirits manufactured at home, perhaps more extensive than France does at present. But two causes concurred to ruin that manufacture; first, oppressive taxes; and next, a prohibition to the manufacturer, of vending his spirits to any but to the farmers of the revenue; a slavery past all endurance. Spanish salt is superior in quality to that of Portugal, and still more to that of France: when refined in Holland, it produces 10 *per cent.* more than the former, and 20 *per cent.* more than the latter; and the making of salt, requires in Spain less labour than in Portugal or in France. Thus Spanish salt may be afforded the cheapest, as requiring less labour; and yet may draw the highest price, as superior in quality: notwithstanding which shining advantages, scarce any salt is exported from Spain; and no wonder, for an exorbitant duty makes it come dearer to the purchaser than any other salt. A more moderate duty would bring more profit to the government; beside easing the labouring poor, and employing them in the manufacture. The superior quality of Spanish raw silk, makes it in great request; but as the duty upon it exceeds 60 *per cent.* it can find no vent in a foreign market: nor is there almost any demand for it at home, as its high price has reduced the silk-manufacture in Spain to the lowest ebb. But the greatest oppression of all, as it affects every sort of manufacture, is the famous tax known by the name of *alcavala*, upon every thing bought and sold, which was laid on in the fifteenth century by a cortes or parliament, limited expressly to eight years, and yet kept up, contrary to law, merely by the King's authority. This monstrous tax, originally 10 *per cent. ad valorem*, was by the two Phillips, III. and IV. augmented to 14 *per cent.*; sufficient of itself to de-

stroy all internal commerce, by the encouragement it gives to smuggling*. The difficulty of recovering payment of such oppressive taxes, heightened the brutality of the farmers; which hastened the downfall of the manufactures: poverty and distress banished such workmen as could find bread elsewhere; and reduced the rest to beggary. The poor husbandmen sunk under the weight of taxes: and as if this had not been sufficient to ruin agriculture totally, the Spanish ministry superadded an absolute prohibition against exporting corn. The most amazing article of all is, that it has been the practice, for more than three centuries, to set a price on corn; which ruins the farmer when the price is low, and yet refuses him the relief of a high price. That agriculture in Spain should be in a deep consumption, is far from being a wonder: it is rather a wonder that it has not long ago died of that disease. Formerly there was plenty of corn for twenty millions of inhabitants, with a surplus for the great city of Rome; and yet at present, and for very many years back, there has not been corn for seven millions, its present inhabitants. Their only resource for procuring even the necessities of life, were the treasures of the new world, which could not last for ever; and Spain became so miserably poor, that Philip IV. was necessitated to give a currency

* The following passage is from Ustariz, ch. 96. "After mature consideration of the duties imposed upon commodities, I have not discovered in France, England, or Holland, any duty laid upon the home-sale of their own manufactures, whether the first or any subsequent sale. As Spain alone groans under the burden of 14 *per cent.* imposed not only on the first sale of every parcel, but on each sale, I am jealous that this strange tax is the chief cause of the ruin of our manufactures." As to the ruinous consequences of this tax, see Bernardo de Ulloa upon the manufactures and commerce of Spain, Part 1. ch. 3. ch. 13. And yet so blind was Philip II. of Spain, as to impose the alcavala upon the Netherlands, a country flourishing in commerce both internal and external. It must have given a violent shock to their manufactures.

to his copper coin, almost equal to that of silver. Thus in Spain, the downfall of husbandry, arts, and commerce, was not occasioned by expulsion of the Moors, and far less by discovery of a new world *, of which the gold and silver were favourable to husbandry at least; but by exorbitant taxes, a voracious monster, which, after swallowing up the whole riches of the kingdom, has left nothing for itself to feed on. The following picture is drawn by a writer of that nation, who may be depended on for veracity as well as knowledge (a). "Poverty and distress dispeople a country, by banishing all thoughts of marriage. They even destroy sucking children; for what nourishment can a woman afford to her infant, who herself is reduced to bread and water, and is overwhelmed with labour and despair? A greater proportion accordingly die here in infancy, than where the labouring poor are more at ease; and of those who escape by strength of constitution, the scarcity of cloathing and of nourishment makes them commonly short-lived."

So blind however are the Spaniards in the administration of their finances, that the present ministry are following out the same measures in America, that have brought their native country to the brink of ruin. Cochineal, cocoa, sugar, &c. imported

* Ustariz, in his Theory and practice of commerce, proves from evident facts, that the depopulation of Spain is not occasioned by the West Indies. From Castile few go to America, and yet Castile is the worst peopled country in Spain. The northern provinces, Gallicia, Asturia, Biscay, &c. send more people to Mexico and Peru than all the other provinces; and yet of all are the most populous. He ascribes the depopulation of Spain to the ruin of the manufactures by oppressive taxes; and asserts, that the West Indies tend rather to people Spain: many return home laden with riches; and of those who do not return, many remit money to their relations, which enables them to marry, and to rear children.

(a) Don Gieronimo de Ustariz.

into Spain duty-free, would be a vast fund of commerce with other nations : but a heavy duty on importation is an absolute bar to that commerce, by forcing the other European nations to provide themselves elsewhere. Spanish oil exported to America would be a great article of commerce, were it not barred by a heavy duty on exportation, equal almost to a prohibition : and the Spanish Americans, for want of oil, are reduced to use fat and butter, very improper for a hot climate. The prohibition of planting vines in Mexico, and the excessive duty on the importation of Spanish wines into that country, have introduced a spirit drawn from the sugar-cane, which, being more destructive than a pestilence, is prohibited under severe penalties. The prohibition however has no effect, but to give the governors of the provinces a monopoly of those spirits, which, under their protection, are sold publicly ; a commerce no less shameful than destructive.

But this subject seems to be inexhaustible. The silver and gold mines in the Spanish West Indies are, by improper taxes, rendered less profitable, both to the King and to the proprietors, than they ought to be. The King's share is the fifth part of the silver, and the tenth part of the gold, that the mines produce. There is beside a duty of eighty piastres, upon every quintal of mercury employ'd in these mines. These heavy exactions, have occasioned an abandon of all mines but what are of the richest sort. The inhabitants pay 33 *per cent.* on the goods imported to them from Spain, and they are subjected beside to the alcavala, which is 14 *per cent.* for every thing bought and sold within the country. The most provoking tax of all is what is termed *la cruciade*, being a sum paid for indulgence to eat eggs, butter, and cheese, during Lent, which is yielded by the Pope to the King of Spain. The government, it is true, obliges no person to take out such an indulgence : but the priests refuse every religious consolation to those who do not purchase ; and there is not perhaps a single person in Spanish

Spanish America who is bold enough to stand out against such oppression.

There is recorded in history, another example of destructive taxes similar to that now mentioned. Augustus, on his conquest of Egypt, having brought to Rome the treasure of its kings, gold and silver overflowed in Italy; the bulk of which found its way to Constantinople, when it became the seat of empire. By these means, Italy was sadly impoverished: the whole ground had been covered with gardens and villas, now deserted; and there was neither corn nor manufactures to exchange for money. Gold and silver became now as rare in Italy as they had been of old; and yet the same taxes that had been paid with ease during plenty of money, were rigidly exacted, which ruined all.

END of the FIRST VOLUME.

727 l 29

~~727 l 26~~ 27 26

S K E T C H E S
O F T H E
H I S T O R Y O F M A N .

V O L U M E I I

SKETCHES

SKETCHES

HISTORY OF THE

HISTORY OF THE

VOLUME II

THE HISTORY OF THE
THE HISTORY OF THE
THE HISTORY OF THE

14.

S K E T C H E S

O F T H E

H I S T O R Y O F M A N .

I N T W O V O L U M E S .

VOLUME II.

12 81

EDINBURGH:

Printed for W. CREECH, Edinburgh; and for
W. STRAHAN, and T. CADELL, London.

MDCCLXXIV.

5



S K E T C H E S
O F T H E
H I S T O R Y O F M A N .

B O O K I I .

Progress of M E N in S O C I E T Y .

S K E T C H I X .

M I L I T A R Y Branch of G O V E R N M E N T .

DURING the infancy of a nation, every member depends on his own industry for procuring the necessities of life: he is his own mason, his own tailor, his own physician; and on himself he chiefly relies for offence as well as defence. Every savage can say, what few beggars among us can say, *Omnia mea mecum porto*; and hence the aptitude

of a savage for war, which makes little alteration in his manner of living. In early times accordingly, the men were all warriors, and every known art was exercised by women; which is the case at present of American savages. And even after arts were so much improved as to be exercised by men, none who could bear arms were exempted from war. In feudal governments, the military spirit was carried to a great height: all gentlemen were soldiers by profession; and every other art was despised, as low, if not contemptible.

Even in this untoward state, arts made some progress, not excepting those for amusement; and many conveniencies, formerly unknown, became necessary to comfortable living. A man cannot bear to be deprived of the conveniencies and amusements to which he is accustomed: he hates war, and clings to the sweets of peace. Hence the necessity of a military establishment, hardening men by strict discipline to endure the fatigues of war. By standing armies, war is carried on more regularly and scientifically than in feudal governments; and as it is carried on with infinitely greater expence, nations are more reserved in declaring war than formerly. Long experience has at the same time made it evident, that a nation seldom gains by war; and that agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, are the only solid foundations of power and grandeur. These arts accordingly have become the chief objects of European governments, and the only rational causes of war. Among the warlike nations of Greece and Italy, how would it have sounded, that their effeminate descendants would employ soldiers by profession to fight their battles? And yet this is necessary, in every country where arts and manufactures flourish; which, requiring little exercise, tend to enervate the body, and of course the mind. Gain, at the same time, being the sole object of industry, advances selfishness to be the ruling passion, and brings on a timid anxiety about property and self-preservation.

Cyrus,

Cyrus, tho' flaming with resentment against the Lydians for revolting, listened to the following sagacious advice, offered by Croesus, their former King. " O Cyrus, destroy not Sardis, an ancient city, famous for arts and arms ; but, pardoning what is past, demand all their arms, encourage luxury, and exhort them to instruct their children in every art of gainful commerce. You will soon see, O King, that instead of men, they will be women." The Arabians, a brave and generous people, conquered Spain, and drove into the inaccessible mountains of Biscay and Asturia, the few natives who stood out. When no longer an enemy appeared, they turned their swords into ploughshares, and became a rich and flourishing nation. The inhabitants of the mountains, hardened by poverty and situation, ventured, after a long interval, to peep out from their strong-holds, and to lie in wait for straggling parties. Finding themselves now a match for a people, whom opulence had betrayed to luxury, and the arts of peace to cowardice ; they took courage to display their banners in the open field ; and after many military achievements, succeeded in reconquering Spain. The Scots, inhabiting the mountainous parts of Caledonia, were an overmatch for the Picts, who occupied the fertile plains, and at last subdued them *.

* Before the time that all Scotland was brought under one king, the highlanders, divided into tribes or clans, made war upon each other ; and continued the same practice irregularly many ages after they submitted to the king of Scotland. Open war was repressed, but it went on privately by depredations and reprisals. The clan-spirit was much depressed by their bad success in the rebellion 1745 ; and totally crushed after the rebellion 1745. The mildness with which the highlanders have been treated of late, and the pains that have been taken to introduce industry among them, have totally extirpated depredations and reprisals, and have rendered them the most peaceable people in Scotland ; but have at the same time reduced their military spirit to a low ebb. To train them for war, military discipline has now become no less necessary than to others.

Where arts, manufactures, and commerce, have arrived at perfection, a pacific spirit prevails universally: not a spark is left of military ardor, nor will any man be a soldier. Hence in such a state, the necessity of mercenary troops, hired among nations less effeminate, who fight for pay, not for the state they serve. Benjamin de Tudele, a Spanish Jew, who wrote in the twelfth century, reports, that the Greeks, by luxury and effeminacy, had contracted a degree of softness, that made them resemble women more than men; and that the Greek Emperor was reduced to the necessity of employing mercenary troops, to defend his country against the Turks. And accordingly when, in the year 1453, the city of Constantinople, defended by a garrison not exceeding 6000 men, was besieged by the Turks, and reduced to extremity, not a single inhabitant had courage to take up arms, all waiting with torpid despondence the hour of utter extirpation. Venice, Genoa, and other small Italian states, became so effeminate by long and successful commerce, that not a citizen ever thought of serving in the army; which obliged them to employ mercenaries, officers as well as private men. These mercenaries at first fought conscientiously for their pay; but reflecting, that the victors were not better paid than the vanquished, they learned to play booty. In a battle particularly between the Pisans and Florentines, which lasted from sun-rising to sun-setting, there was but a single man lost, who, having accidentally fallen from his horse, was trode under foot. Charles VIII. of France, when he invaded Italy *anno* 1498, understood nothing of such mock battles; and his men were held to be devils incarnate, who seemed to take delight in shedding human blood. The Dutch, who for many years have been reduced to mercenary troops, are more indebted to the mutual jealousy of their neighbours for their independence, than to their own army. In the year 1672, Lewis of France invaded Holland, and in forty days took forty walled towns. That country

country was saved, not by its army, but by being laid under water. Frost, which is usual at that season, would have put an end to the seven United Provinces.

The small principality of Palmyra is the only instance known in history, where the military spirit was not enervated by opulence. Pliny describes that country as extremely pleasant, and blessed with plenty of springs, tho' surrounded with dry and sandy deserts. The commerce of the Indies was at that time carried on by land; and the city of Palmyra was the centre of that commerce between the East and the West. Its territory being very small, little more than sufficient for villas and pleasure-grounds, the inhabitants, like those of Hamburgh, had no way to employ their riches for profit but in trade. At the same time, being situated between the two mighty empires of Rome and Parthia, it required great address, and the most assiduous military discipline, to preserve the inhabitants from being swallowed up by the one or the other. This ticklish situation preserved them from luxury and effeminacy, the usual concomitants of riches. They made a better figure with their superfluous wealth: they laid it out on magnificent buildings, and adorning their country-seats. The fine arts in general, were among them carried to a high degree of perfection. The famous Zenobia, their Queen, led captive to Rome after being deprived of her dominions, was admired and celebrated for spirit, for learning, and for an exquisite taste in the fine arts.

Thus, by accumulating wealth, a manufacturing and commercial people become a tempting object for conquest; and by effeminacy become an easy conquest. The military spirit seems to be much decayed in Britain; and ere it be gone, will no phantom appear, even in a dream, to disturb our downy rest? Formerly, the culture of corn in the temperate regions of Europe and Asia, proved a tempting bait to northern savages who wanted bread:

have

have we no cause to dread a similar fate from some warlike neighbour, impelled by hunger, or by ambition, to extend his dominions? The difficulty of providing for defence, without hurting industry, has produced a general opinion among political writers, that a nation, if it will preserve its military spirit, must exclude industry; and, if it will preserve its industry, must give up all hopes of retaining its military spirit. In the former case, we are secure against any invader: in the latter, we indeed make a considerable figure, but lie open to every invader. Happy would Britain be, could the spirit of war and of commerce be made compatible by some military plan, that would protect us against enemies, without hurting our industry and manufactures. That such a plan is not absolutely impracticable, will, I hope, appear from what follows; tho' I am far from hoping that it will meet with universal approbation. To prepare the reader, I shall premise an account of the different military establishments that exist, and have existed, in Europe, with the advantages and disadvantages of each. In examining these, who knows whether some hint may not occur of a plan more perfect than any of them.

The most illustrious military establishment of antiquity is that of the Romans, by which they subdued almost all the known world. The Roman citizens were many of them husbandmen, and all of them soldiers. The inhabitants of Rome, in particular, lived upon their pay when in the field; but if they happened not to be successful in plundering, they had no means of living at home. An annual distribution of corn among them became necessary, which in effect corresponded to the halfpay of our officers. It is believed, that such a constitution would not be adopted by any modern state. It was a forc'd constitution; contrary to nature, which gives different dispositions to men, in order to supply hands for every necessary art. It was, at the same time, extremely precarious, there being in it no medium between universal

verfal conquest and the most wretched slavery. Had the Gauls, who conquered Rome, entertained any view but of plunder, Rome would never have been more heard of. It was on the brink of ruin in the war with Hannibal. What would have happened had Hannibal been victorious? It is easy to judge, by comparing it with Carthage. Carthage was a commercial state, the people all employ'd in arts, manufactures, and navigation. The Carthaginians were subdued; but they could not be reduced to extremity, while they had access to the sea. In fact, they prospered so much by commerce, even after they were subdued, as to raise jealousy in their masters, who thought themselves not secure while a house remained standing in Carthage. On the other hand, what resource for the inhabitants of Rome, had they been subdued? They must have perished by hunger; for they could not work. In a word, ancient Rome resembles a gamester who ventures all upon one decisive throw: if he lose, he is undone.

I take it for granted, that our feudal system will not have a single vote. It was a system that led to confusion and anarchy, as little fitted for war as for peace. And as for mercenary troops, it is unnecessary to bring them again into the field, after what is said of them above.

The only remaining forms that merit attention, are a standing army, and a militia; which I shall examine, in their order, with the objections that lie against each. The first standing army in modern times was established by Charles VII. of France, on a very imperfect plan. By an edict *anno* 1448, he appointed each parish to furnish an archer: these were termed *franc-archers*, because they were exempted from all taxes. This little army was intended for restoring peace and order at home, not for disturbing neighbouring states. This good prince had been forced into many perilous wars, some of them for restraining the turbulent spirit of his vassals, and most of them for defending his crown against

gainst a powerful adversary, Henry V. of England. As these wars were carried on in the feudal manner, the soldiers, who had no pay, could not be restrained from plundering; and inveterate practice rendered them equally licentious in peace and in war. Charles, to leave no pretext for free quarters, laid upon his subjects a small tax, sufficient for regular pay to his little army*.

First attempts are commonly crude and defective. The franchisers, dispersed one by one in different villages, and never collected but in time of action, could not easily be brought under regular discipline. They were idle when not in the field; and in the field, they display'd nothing but vicious habits, a spirit of laziness, of disorder, and of pilfering. Neither in peace were they of any use: their character of soldier made them despise agriculture, without being qualified for war: in the army they were no better than peasants: at the plough, no better than idle soldiers. But in the hands of a monarch, a standing army is an instrument of power, too valuable ever to be abandoned: if one sovereign entertain such an army, others in self-defence must follow the example. Standing armies are now established in every European state, and are brought to a competent degree of perfection.

This new instrument of government, has produced a wonderful change in manners. We now rely on a standing army, for

* This was the first tax imposed in France without consent of the three estates: and, however unconstitutional, it occasioned not the slightest murmur, because the visible good tendency of the tax reconciled all the world to it. Charles, beside, was a favourite of his people; and justly, as he shewed by every act his affection for them. Had our first Charles been such a favourite, who knows, whether the taxes he imposed without consent of parliament, would have met with any opposition? Such taxes would have become customary, as in France; and a limited monarchy would, as in France, have become absolute. Governments, like men, are liable to many revolutions: we remain, it is true, a free people; but for that blessing, we are perhaps more indebted to fortune, than to patriotic vigilance.

defence as well as offence : none but those who are trained to war, ever think of handling arms, or even of defending themselves against an enemy : our people in general have become altogether effeminate, terrified at the very sight of a hostile weapon. It is true, they are not the less qualified for the arts of peace ; and if manufacturers be protected from being obliged to serve in the army, I discover not any incompatibility between a standing army and the highest industry. Husbandmen at the same time make the best soldiers : a military spirit in the lower classes arises from bodily strength, and from affection to their natal soil : both are eminent in the husbandman : constant exercise in the open air renders him hardy and robust ; and fondness for the place where he finds comfort and plenty, attaches him to his country in general *. An artist or manufacturer, on the

* Numquam credo potuisse dubitari, aptiorem armis rusticam plebem, quæ sub divo et in labore nutritur ; solis patiens ; umbræ negligens ; balnearum nescia ; deliciarum ignara ; simplicis animi ; parvo contenta ; duratis ad omnem laborum tolerantiam membris : cui gestare ferrum, fossam ducere, onus ferre, consuetudo de rure est. Nec inficiandum est, post urbem conditam, Romanos ex civitate profectos semper ad bellum : sed tunc nullis voluptatibus, nullis deliciis frangebantur. Sudorem cursu et campestri exercitio collectum nando juvenis abluebat in Tybere. Idem bellator, idem agricola, genera tantum mutabat armorum. *Vegetius, De re militari, l. 1. cap. 3.* — [*In English thus* : “ I believe it was never doubted, that “ the country-labourers were, of all others, the best soldiers. Inured to the open “ air, and habitual toil, subjected to the extremes of heat and cold, ignorant of the “ use of the bath, or any of the luxuries of life, contented with bare necessities, “ there was no severity in any change they could make : their limbs, accustomed to “ the use of the spade and plough, and habituated to burden, were capable of the “ utmost extremity of toil. Indeed, in the earliest ages of the commonwealth, “ while the city was in her infancy, the citizens marched out from the town to “ the field : but at that time they were not enfeebled by pleasures, nor by luxury : “ The military youth, returning from their exercise and martial sports, plunged “ into the Tyber to wash off the sweat and dust of the field. The warrior and the “ husbandman were the same, they changed only the nature of their arms.”]

contrary, is attached to no country but where he finds the best bread; and a sedentary life, enervating his body, renders him pusillanimous. For these reasons, among many, agriculture ought to be honoured and cherished above all other arts. It is not only a fine preparation for war, by breeding men who love their country, and whom labour and sobriety fit for being foldiers; but is also the best foundation for commerce, by furnishing both food and materials to the industrious.

But several objections of the most interesting nature occur against a standing army, that call aloud for a better model than has hitherto been established, at least in Britain. The subject is of importance, and I hope for attention from every man who loves his country. During the vigour of the feudal system, which made every land-proprietor a foldier, every inch of ground was tenaciously disputed with an invader: and while a sovereign retained any part of his dominions, he never lost hopes of recovering the whole. At present, we rely entirely on a standing army, for defence as well as offence, which has reduced every nation of Europe to a very precarious condition. If the army of a state happen to be defeated, even at the most distant frontier, there is little resource against a total conquest. Compare the history of Charles VII. with that of Lewis XIV. Kings of France. The former, tho' driven into a corner by Henry V. of England, and deprived of the bulk of his provinces, was however far from yielding: on the contrary, relying on the military spirit of his people, and indefatigably intent on stratagem and surprise, he recovered all he had lost. When Lewis XIV. succeeded to the crown, the military spirit of the people, was contracted within the narrow span of a standing army. Behold the consequence. That ambitious monarch, having provoked his neighbours into an alliance against him, had no resource against a more numerous army, but to purchase peace by offering to abandon all his conquests, upon which he

he had lavished much blood and treasure (a). France at that period contained several millions capable of bearing arms; and yet was not in a condition to make head against a disciplined army of 70,000 men. Poland, which continues upon the ancient military establishment, wearied out Charles XII. of Sweden, and had done the same to several of his predecessors. But Saxony, defended only by a standing army, could not hold out a single day against the prince now mentioned, at the head of a greater army. Mercenary troops are a defence still more feeble, against troops that fight for glory, or for their country. Unhappy was the invention of a standing army; which, without being any strong bulwark against enemies, is a grievous burden on the people; and turns daily more and more so. Listen to a first-rate author on that point. “*Sitôt qu’ un état augmente ce qu’ il appelle ses troupes, les autres augmentent les leurs; de façon qu’ on ne gagne rien par-là que la ruine commune. Chaque monarque tient sur pied toutes les armées qu’ il pourroit avoir si ses peuples étoient en danger d’ être exterminées; et on nomme paix cet état d’ effort de tous contre tous. Nous sommes pauvres avec les richesses et le commerce de tout l’ univers; et bientôt à force d’ avoir des soldats, nous n’ aurons plus que des soldats, et nous ferons comme de Tartares.*” (b).

“*As soon as one state augments the number of its troops, the neighbouring states of course do the same; so that nothing is gained, and the effect is, the general ruin. Every prince keeps as many armies in pay, as if he dreaded the extermination of his people from a foreign invasion; and this perpetual struggle, maintained by all against all, is termed peace. With the riches and commerce of the whole universe, we are in a state of poverty; and by this continually augmenting our troops, we shall soon have none else but soldiers, and be reduced to the same situation as the Tartars.*”

(a) Treaty of St Gertrudenberg.

(b) L’ esprit des loix, liv. 13. chap. 17.

But with respect to Britain, and every free nation, there is an objection still more formidable ; which is, that a standing army is dangerous to liberty. It avails very little to be secure against foreign enemies, supposing a standing army to afford security, if we have no security against an enemy at home. If a warlike king, heading his own troops, be ambitious to render himself absolute, there are no means to evade the impending blow ; for what avail the greatest number of effeminate cowards against a disciplined army, devoted to their prince, and ready implicitly to execute his commands ? In a word, by relying entirely on a standing army, and by trusting the sword in the hands of men who abhor the restraint of civil laws, a solid foundation is laid for military government. Thus a standing army is dangerous to liberty, and yet no sufficient bulwark against powerful neighbours.

Deeply sensible of the foregoing objections, Harrington proposes a plan for a militia, which he holds to be unexceptionable. Every male between eighteen and thirty, is to be trained to military exercises, by frequent meetings, where the youth are excited by premiums to contend in running, wrestling, shooting at a mark, &c. &c. But Harrington did not advert, that such meetings, enflaming the military spirit, must create an aversion in the people to dull and fatiguing labour. His plan evidently is inconsistent with industry and manufactures : it would be so at least in Britain. A most successful plan it would be, were defence our sole object ; and not the less successful, by rendering Britain so poor as scarce to be a tempting conquest. Our late war with France is a conspicuous instance of the power that can be exerted by a commercial state, entire in its credit ; a power that amaz'd all the world, and ourselves no less than others. Politicians begin to consider Britain, and not France, to be the formidable power that threatens universal monarchy. Had Harrington's plan been adopted, Britain, like Sweden or Denmark, must have been contented with an inferior

inferior station, having no ambition but to draw subsidies from its more potent neighbours.

In Switzerland, it is true, boys are, from the age of twelve, exercised in running, wrestling, and shooting. Every male who can bear arms is regimented, and subjected to military discipline. Here is a militia in perfection upon Harrington's plan, a militia neither forc'd nor mercenary; invincible when fighting for their country: and as the Swiss are by no means an idle people, we learn from this instance, that the martial spirit is not an invincible obstruction to industry. But the original barrenness of Switzerland, compelled the inhabitants to be sober and industrious: and industry hath among them become a second nature, there scarcely being a child above six years of age but who is employ'd, not excepting children of opulent families. England differs widely in the nature of its soil, and of its people. At the same time, there is little occasion to insist upon that difference; as Switzerland affords no clear evidence, that a militia gives no obstruction to a spirit of industry: the Swiss, it is true, may be termed industrious; but their industry is confined to necessities and conveniencies: they are less ambitious of wealth than of military glory; and they have few arts or manufactures, either to support foreign commerce, or to excite luxury.

Fletcher of Salton's plan of a militia, differs little from that of Harrington. Three camps are to be constantly kept up in England, and a fourth in Scotland; into one or other of which, every man must enter upon completing his one and twentieth year. In these camps the art of war is to be acquired and practised: those who can maintain themselves must continue there two years, others but a single year. Secondly, Those who have been thus educated, shall for ever after have fifty yearly meetings, and shall exercise four hours every meeting. It is not said, by what means young men are compelled to resort to the camp; nor is any exception

exception mentioned of persons destin'd for the church, for liberal sciences, or for the fine arts. The weak and the sickly must be exempted; and yet no regulation is proposed against those who absent themselves on a false pretext. But waving these, the capital objection against Harrington's plan strikes equally against Fletcher's, That by rousing a military spirit, it would alienate the minds of our people from arts and manufactures, and from any constant and uniform occupation. The author himself remarks, that the use and exercise of arms, would make the youth place their honour upon that art, and would enflame them with love of military glory; not adverting, that love of military glory, diffused through the whole mass of the people, would unqualify Britain for being a manufacturing and commercial country, rendering it of little weight or consideration in Europe.

The military branch is essential to every species of government: the Quakers are the only people who ever doubted of it. Is it not then mortifying, that a capital branch of government, should to this day remain in a state so imperfect? One would suspect some inherent vice in the nature of government, that counteracts every effort of genius to produce a more perfect mode. I am not disposed to admit any defect of Providence, especially in an article essential to the well-being of society; and rather than yield to the charge, I venture to propose the following plan, even at the hazard of being thought an idle projector. And what animates me greatly to make the attempt is, a firm conviction, that a military and an industrious spirit are of equal importance to Britain; and that if either of them be lost, we are undone. To reconcile these seeming antagonists, is my chief view in the following plan; to which I shall proceed, after paving the way by some preliminary considerations.

The first is, that as military force is essential to every state, no man is exempted from bearing arms for his country: all are bound;

bound; because none can be bound, if every one be not bound. Were any difference to be made, persons of figure and fortune ought first to be called to that service, as being the most interested in the welfare of their country. Listen to a good foldier delivering his opinion on that subject. " Les levées qui se font par surpercherie sont tout aussi odieuses; on met de l'argent dans la pochette d'un homme, et on lui dit qu'il est soldat. Celles qui se font par force, le sont encore plus; c'est une désolation publique, dont le bourgeois et l'habitant ne se sauvent qu'à force d'argent, et dont le fond est toujours un moyen odieux. Ne voudroit-il pas mieux établir, par une loi, que tout homme, de quelque condition qu'il fût, seroit obligé de servir son prince et sa patrie pendant cinq ans? Cette loi ne sauroit être désapprouvée, parce qu'il est naturel et juste que les citoyens s'emploient pour la défense de l'état. Cette methode de lever des troupes seroit un fond inépuisable de belles et bonnes recrues, qui ne seroient pas sujetes à déserter. L'on se feroit même, par la suite, un honneur et un devoir de server sa tâche. Mais, pour y parvenir, il faudroit n'en excepter aucune condition, être sévère sur ce point, et s'attacher à faire exécuter cette loi de préférence aux nobles et aux riches. Personne n'en murmurerait. Alors ceux qui auroient servi leur temps, verroient avec mépris ceux qui repugneroient à cette loi, et insensiblement on se feroit un honneur de servir: le pauvre bourgeois seroit consolé par l'exemple du riche; et celui-ci n'oseroit se plaindre, voyant servir le noble (a) *."

(a) Les reveries du Comte de Saxe.

* " The method of inlusting men, by putting a trick upon them, is fully as odious. They slip a piece of money into a man's pocket, and then tell him he is a soldier. Inlusting by force is still more odious. It is a public calamity, from which the citizen has no means of saving himself but by money; and it is consequently the worst of all the resources of government. Would it not be more expedient

Take another preliminary consideration. While there remained any portion of our original martial spirit, the difficulty was not great of recruiting the army. But that task hath of late years become extremely troublesome; and more disagreeable still than troublesome, by the necessity of using deceitful arts for trepanning the unwary youth. Nor are such arts always successful: in our late war with France, we were necessitated to give up even the appearance of voluntary service, and to recruit the army on the solid principle of obliging every man to fight for his country: the justices of peace were empowered by the legislature, to force into the service such as could be best spared from civil occupation. If a single clause had been added, limiting the service to five or seven years, the measure would have been unexceptionable, even in a land of liberty. To relieve officers of the army from practising deceitful arts for recruiting their corps, by substituting a fair and constitutional mode, was a valuable improvement. It was of importance with respect to its direct intendment; but of much greater with respect to its consequences. One of the

“expedient to enact a law, obliging every man, whatever be his rank, to serve his
 “King and country for five years? This law could not be disapproved of, because it is consistent both with nature and justice, that every citizen should be
 “employed in the defence of the state. Here would be an inexhaustible fund of
 “good and able soldiers, who would not be apt to desert, as every man would
 “reckon it both his honour and his duty to have served his time. But to effect
 “this, it must be a fixed principle, That there shall be no exception of ranks. This
 “point must be rigorously attended to, and the law must be enforced, by way of
 “preference, first among the nobility and the men of wealth. There would not
 “be a single man who would complain of it. A person who had served his time,
 “would treat with contempt another who should show reluctance to comply with
 “the law; and thus, by degrees, it would become a task of honour. The poor
 “citizen would be comforted and inspirited by the example of his rich neighbour;
 “and he again would have nothing to complain of, when he saw that the noble-
 “man was not exempted from service.”

few

few disadvantages of a free state, is licentiousness in the common people, who may wallow in disorder and profligacy without control, if they be but cautious to refrain from gross crimes, punishable by law. Now, as it appears to me, there never has been devised a method more efficacious for restoring industry and sobriety, than that under consideration. Its salutary effects were conspicuous, even during the short time it subsisted. The dread of being forc'd into the service, rendered the populace peaceable and orderly: it did more; it rendered them industrious in order to conciliate favour. The most beneficial discoveries have been accidental: without having any view but for recruiting the army, our legislature stumbled upon an excellent method for reclaiming the idle and the profligate; a matter, in the present depravity of manners, of greater importance than any other that concerns the police of Britain. A perpetual law of that kind, by promoting industry, would prove a sovereign remedy against mobs and riots, diseases of a free country, full of people and of manufactures *. Why were the foregoing statutes, for there were two of them, limited to a temporary existence? There is not on record another statute better intitled to immortality.

And now to the project, which, after all my efforts, I produce with trepidation; not that I doubt of its solidity, but as ill suited to the present manners of this island. To hope that it will be put in practice, would indeed be highly ridiculous: this can never happen, till patriotism flourish more in Britain than it has done for some time past. Supposing now an army of 60,000 men to be

* Several late mobs in the south of England, all of them on pretext of scarcity, greatly alarmed the administration. A fact was discovered by a private person (*Six-weeks tour through the south of England*), which our ministers ought to have discovered, that these mobs constantly happened where wages were high and provisions low; consequently that they were occasioned, not by want, but by wantonness.

sufficient for Britain, a rational method for raising such an army, were there no standing forces, would be, that land-proprietors, in proportion to their valued rents, should furnish men to serve seven years, and no longer *. But as it would be no less unjust than imprudent, to disband at once our present army, the soft and natural way is, to begin with moulding gradually the old army into the new, by filling up vacancies with men bound to serve seven years and no longer. And for raising proper men, a matter of much delicacy, it is proposed, that in every shire a special commission be given to certain landholders of rank and figure, to raise recruits out of the lower classes, selecting always those who are the least useful at home.

Second. Those who claim to be dismissed after serving the appointed time, shall never again be called to the service, except in case of an actual invasion. Every one of them shall be intitled to a premium of eight or ten pounds, for enabling him to follow a trade or calling, without being subjected to corporation-laws. The private men in France are enlisted but for six years; and that mode has never been attended with any inconvenience.

Third. With respect to the private men, idleness must be totally and for ever banished. Supposing three months yearly to be sufficient for military discipline, the men, during the rest of the year, ought to be employ'd upon public works, forming roads, erecting bridges, making rivers navigable, clearing harbours, &c. &c. Why not also furnish men for half-pay to private undertakers of useful works? And supposing the daily pay of a soldier to be ten pence, it would greatly encourage

* In Denmark, every land-proprietor of a certain rent, is obliged to furnish a militia-man, whom he can withdraw at pleasure upon substituting another; an excellent method for taming the peasants, and for rendering them industrious.

extensive improvements, to have at command a number of stout fellows, under strict discipline, at the low wages of five pence a-day. An army of 60,000 men thus employ'd, would not be so expensive to the public, as 20,000 men upon the present establishment: for beside the money contributed by private undertakers, public works carried on by soldiers, will be miserably ill contrived, if not cheaply purchased with their pay*.

The most important branch of the project, is what regards the officers. The necessity of reviving in our people of rank some portion of military spirit, will be acknowledged by every person of reflection; and in that view, the following articles are proposed. First: That there be two classes of officers, one serving for pay, one without pay. In filling up every vacant office of cornet or ensign, the latter are to be preferred; but in progressive advancement, no distinction is to be made between the classes. An officer who has served seven years without pay, may retire with honour.

Second. No man shall be privileged to represent a county in parliament, who has not served seven years without pay; and, excepting an actual burghers, none but those who have performed that service, shall be privileged to represent a borough. The same qualification shall be necessary to every one who aspires to serve the public or the King in an office of dignity, excepting only churchmen and lawyers, with regard to offices in their respective professions. In old Rome, none were admitted candidates for any civil employment, till they had served ten years in the army.

Third. Officers of this class are to be exempted from the taxes

* Taking this for granted, I bring only into the calculation the pay of the three months spent in military discipline; and the calculation is very simple, the pay of 20,000 for twelve months amounting to a greater sum than the pay of 60,000 for three months.

imposed on land, coaches, windows, and plate; not for saving a trifling sum, but as a mark of distinction.

The military spirit must in Britain be miserably low, if such regulations prove not effectual to decorate the army with officers of figure and fortune. Nor need we to apprehend any bad consequence, from a number of raw officers who serve without pay; among men of birth, emulation will have a more commanding influence than pay or profit; and at any rate, there will always be a sufficiency of old and experienc'd officers receiving pay, ready to take the lead in every difficult enterprize.

Fourth. To improve this army in military discipline, it is proposed, that when occasion offers, 5 or 6000 of them be maintained by Great Britain, as auxiliaries to some ally at war. And if that body be changed from time to time, knowledge and practice in war will be diffused thro' the whole army.

Officers who serve for pay, will be greatly benefited by this plan: frequent removes of those who serve without pay, make way for them; and from the very nature of the plan, buying and selling is absolutely excluded.

I proceed to the alterations necessary for accommodating this plan to our present military establishment. As a total revolution at one instant would breed confusion, the first step ought to be a specimen only, such as the levying two or three regiments on the new model; the expence of which ought not to be grudged, as the forces presently in pay, are not sufficient, even in peace, to answer the ordinary demands of government. And as the prospect of civil employments, will excite more men of rank to offer their service than there is room for, the choice must be in the crown, not only with respect to the new regiments, but with respect to the vacant cornetries and ensigncies in the old army. But as these regulations will not instantly produce men qualified to be secretaries of state or commissioners of treasury, so numerous as to afford

afford his Majesty a satisfactory choice, that branch of the plan may be suspended, till those who have served seven years without pay, amount to one hundred at least. The article that concerns members of parliament must be still longer suspended: it may however, after the first seven years, receive execution in part, by privileging those who have received no pay to represent a borough, refusing that privilege to others, except to actual burgesses. We may proceed one step farther, That if in a county there be five gentlemen who have the qualification under consideration, over and above the ordinary legal qualifications, one of the five must be chosen, leaving the electors free as to their other representative.

With respect to the private men of the old army, a thousand of such as have served the longest may be disbanded annually, if so many be willing to retire; and in their stead an equal number may be enlisted, to serve but seven years. Upon such a plan, it will not be difficult to find recruits.

The advantage of this plan, in one particular, is eminent. It will infallibly fill the army with gallant officers: Other advantages concerning the officers themselves, shall be mentioned afterward. An appetite for military glory, cannot fail to be roused in officers who serve without pay, when their service is the only passport to employments of trust and honour. And may we not hope, that officers who serve for pay, will, by force of imitation, be inspired with the same appetite? Nothing ought to be more sedulously inculcated into every officer, than to despise riches, as a mercantile object, below the dignity of a soldier. Often has the courage of victorious troops been blunted by the pillage of an opulent city; and may not rich captures at sea have the same effect? Some sea-commanders have been suspected, of bestowing their fire more willingly upon a merchantman, than upon a ship of war. A triumph, an ovation, a civic crown, or some such mark of honour, were

were in old Rome the only rewards for military achievements *. Money, it is true, was sometimes distributed among the private men, as an addition to their pay, after a fatiguing campaign; but not as a recompence for their good behaviour, because all shared alike. It did not escape the penetrating Romans, that wealth, the parent of luxury and selfishness, fails not to eradicate the military spirit. The soldier who to recover his baggage performed a bold action, gave an instructive lesson to all governments. Being invited by his general to try his fortune a second time; Invite, says the soldier, one who has lost his baggage. Many a bold adventurer goes to the Indies, who, returning with a fortune, is afraid of every breeze. Britain, I suspect, is too much infected with the spirit of gain. Will it be thought ridiculous in any man of figure, to prefer reputation and respect before riches; provided only he can afford a frugal meal, and a warm garment? Let us compare an old officer, who never deserted his friend nor his country, and a wealthy merchant, who never indulged a thought but of gain: the wealth is tempting; — and yet does there exist a man of spirit, who would not be the officer rather than the merchant, even with his millions? Sultan Mechmet granted to the Janisaries a privilege of importing foreign commodities free of duty: was it his intention to metamorphose soldiers into merchants, loving peace, and hating war?

But tho' I declare against large appointments beforehand, which,

* A Roman triumph was finely contrived to excite heroism; and a sort of triumph not less splendid, was display'd by the Fatemite Califs of Egypt. After returning from a successful expedition, the Calif pitched his camp in a spacious plain near his capital, where he was attended by all his grandees, in their finest equipages. Three days were commonly spent in all manner of rejoicings, feasting, music, fireworks, &c. He marched into the city with this great cavalcade, through roads covered with rich carpets, strewed with flowers, gums, and odoriferous plants, and hedged on both sides with crouds of congratulating subjects.

instead

instead of promoting service, are a temptation to luxury and idleness; yet to an officer of character, who has spent his younger years in serving his king and country, a government, or other suitable employment that enables him to pass the remainder of his life in ease and affluence, is a proper reward for merit, reflecting equal honour on the prince who bestows, and on the subject who receives; beside affording an enlivening prospect to others, who have it at heart to do well.

With respect to the private men, the rotation proposed, aims at improvements far more important, than that of making military service fall light upon individuals. It tends to unite the spirit of industry with that of war, and to form the same man to be an industrious labourer, as well as a good soldier. The continual exercise recommended, cannot fail to produce a spirit of industry; which will occasion a demand for the private men after their seven years service, as valuable above all other labourers, not only for regularity, but for activity. And with respect to service in war, constant exercise is the life of an army, in the literal as well as metaphorical sense. Boldness is inspired by strength and agility, to which constant motion mainly contributes. The Roman citizens, trained to arms from their infancy, and never allowed to rest, were invincible. To mention no other works, spacious and durable roads carried to the very extremities of that vast empire, show clearly how the soldiers were employ'd during peace; which hardened them for war, and made them orderly and submissive (a). So essential was labour held by the Romans for training an army, that they never ventured to face an enemy, with troops debilitated in any degree by idleness. The Roman army in Spain, having been worsted in several engagements, and confined within their entrenchments, were sunk in idleness and

(a) Bergiere *histoire des grands chemins*, vol. 2. p. 157.

luxury.

luxury. Scipio Nafica, after demolishing Carthage, taking the command of that army, durst not oppose it to the enemy, till he accustomed the soldiers to temperance and hard labour. He exercised them without relaxation in marching and countermarching, in fortifying camps and demolishing them, in digging trenches and filling them up, in building high walls and pulling them down; he himself, from morning to night, going about, and directing every operation. Marius, before engaging the Cimbri, exercised his army in turning the course of a river. Appian relates, that Antiochus, during his winter-quarters at Calchis, having married a beautiful virgin, with whom he was greatly enamoured, spent the whole winter in pleasure, abandoning his army to vice and idleness: and when the time of action returned with the spring, he found his soldiers unfit for service. The idleness of our soldiers in time of peace, promoting debauchery and licentiousness, is no less destructive to health than to discipline. Unable for the fatigues of a first campaign, our private men die in thousands, as if smote with a pestilence*. We never read of any mortality in the Roman legions, tho' frequently engaged in climates very different from their own. Let us listen to a judicious writer, to whom every one listens with delight: " Nous remarquons
 " aujourd'hui, que nos armées périssent beaucoup par le travail

* The idleness of British soldiers appears from a transaction of the commissioners of the annexed estates in Scotland. After the late war with France, they judged, that part of the King's rents could not be better bestow'd, than in giving bread to the disbanded soldiers. Houses were built for them, portions of land given them to cultivate at a very low rent, and maintenance afforded them till they could reap a crop. These men could not wish to be better accommodated: but so accustomed they had been to idleness, and change of place, as to be incapable of any sort of work: they deserted their farms one after another, and commenced thieves and beggars. Such as had been made serjeants must be excepted: these were sensible fellows, and prospered in their little farms.

" immodéré

"immodéré des soldats; et cependant c'étoit par un travail im-
 "mense que les Romains se conservoient. La raison en est, je
 "crois, que leurs fatigues étoient continuelles; au lieu que nos
 "soldats passent sans cesse d'un travail extrême à une extrême oi-
 "sivété, ce qui est la chose du monde la plus propre à les faire
 "perir. Il faut que je rapporte ici ce que les auteurs nous disent
 "de l'éducation de soldats Romains. On les accoutumoit à aller
 "à pas militaire, c'est-à-dire, à faire en cinq heures vingt milles,
 "et quelquefois vingt-quatre. Pendant ces marches, on leur fai-
 "soit porter de poids de soixante livres. On les entretenoit dans
 "l'habitude de courir et de sauter tout armés; ils prenoient
 "dans leurs exercices des épées, de javelots, de flèches, d'une pé-
 "santeur double des armes ordinaires; et ces exercices étoient
 "continuels. Des hommes si endurcis étoient ordinairement
 "sains; on ne remarque pas dans les auteurs que les armées Ro-
 "maines, qui faisoient la guerre en tant de climats, perissoient
 "beaucoup par les maladies; au lieu qu'il arrive presque conti-
 "nuellement aujourd'hui, que des armées, sans avoir combattu,
 "se fondent, pour ainsi dire, dans une campagne * (a)." Ma-
 "rsechal

(a) Montesquieu, *Grandeur de Romains*, chap. 2.

"We observe now-a-days, that our armies are consumed by the fatigues and
 "severe labour of the soldiers; and yet it was alone by labour and toil that the
 "Romans preserved themselves from destruction. I believe the reason is, that
 "their fatigue was continual and unremitting, while the life of our soldiers is a
 "perpetual transition from severe labour to extreme indolence, a life the most rui-
 "nous of all others. I must here recite the account which the Roman authors
 "give of the education of their soldiers. They were continually habituated to the
 "military pace, which was, to march in five hours twenty, and sometimes twenty-
 "five miles. In these marches each soldier carried sixty pounds weight. They
 "were accustomed to run and leap in arms; and in their military exercises,
 "their swords, javelins, and arrows, were of twice the ordinary weight. These

marshal Saxe, a soldier, not a physician, ascribes to the use of vinegar the healthiness of the Roman legions: were vinegar so potent, it would of all liquors be the most in request. Exercise without intermission, during peace as well as during war, produced that salutary effect; which every prince will find, who is disposed to copy the Roman discipline*. The Marshal guesses better with respect to a horse. Discouraging of cavalry, he observes, that a horse becomes hardy and healthful by constant exercise, and that a young horse is unable to bear fatigue; for which reason he declares against young horses for the service of an army.

That the military branch of the British government is susceptible of improvements, all the world will admit. To improve it, I have contributed my mite; which is humbly submitted to the public, a judge from whom there lies no appeal. It is submitted in three views. The first is, Whether an army, modelled as above, would not secure us against the boldest invader; the next, Whether such an army be as dangerous to liberty, as an army in its

“ exercises were continual, which so strengthened the constitution of the men,
 “ that they were always in health. We see no remarks in the Roman authors,
 “ that their armies, in the variety of climates where they made war, ever perished
 “ by disease; whilst now-a-days it is not unusual, that an army, without ever
 “ coming to an engagement, dwindles away by disease in one campaign.”

* *Rei militaris periti, plus quotidiana armorum exercitia ad sanitatem militum putaverunt prodesse, quam medicos. Ex quo intelligitur quanto studiosius armorum artem docendus sit semper exercitus, cum ei laboris consuetudo et in castris sanitatem, et in conflictu possit præstare victoriam. Vegetius, De re militari, lib. 3. cap. 2.* — [In English thus: “ Our masters of the art-military were of opinion, “ that daily exercise in arms contributed more to the health of the troops, than “ the skill of the physician: from which we may judge, what care should be “ taken, to habituate the soldiers to the exercise of arms, to which they owe both “ their health in the camp, and their victory in the field.”] — The same author observes, that the Romans in his time had become so inactive, as to leave off the fortifying their camps.

present

present form; and the last, Whether it would not be a school of industry and moderation to our people.

With respect to the first, we should, after a few years, have not only an army of sixty thousand well-disciplined troops, but the command of another army, equally numerous, and equally well disciplined. It is true, that troops inured to war have an advantage over troops that have not the same experience: but with assurance it may be pronounced impracticable, to land at once in Britain an army that can stand against 100,000 British soldiers well disciplined, fighting even their first battle, for their country, and for their wives and children.

A war with France raises a panic on every sight threatening of an invasion. The security afforded by the proposed plan, would enable us to act offensively at sea, instead of being reduced to keep our ships at home, for guarding our coasts. Would Britain any longer be obliged to support her continental connections? No sooner does an European prince augment his army, or improve military discipline, than his neighbours, taking fright, must do the same. May not one hope, that by the plan proposed, or some such, Britain would be relieved from jealousy and solicitude about its neighbours?

With respect to the second view, having long enjoy'd the sweets of a free government, under a succession of mild princes, we begin to forget, that our liberties ever were in danger. But drowsy security is of all conditions the most dangerous; because the state may be overwhelmed before we even dream of danger. Suppose only, that a British King, accomplished in the art of war, and beloved by his soldiers, heads his own troops in a war with France; and after more than one successful campaign, gives peace to his enemy, on terms advantageous to his people: what security have we for our liberties, when he returns with a victorious army, devoted to his will? I am talking of a standing

mareschal Saxe, a soldier, not a physician, ascribes to the use of vinegar the healthiness of the Roman legions: were vinegar so potent, it would of all liquors be the most in request. Exercise without intermission, during peace as well as during war, produced that salutary effect; which every prince will find, who is disposed to copy the Roman discipline *. The Mareschal guesses better with respect to a horse. Discouraging of cavalry, he observes, that a horse becomes hardy and healthful by constant exercise, and that a young horse is unable to bear fatigue; for which reason he declares against young horses for the service of an army.

That the military branch of the British government is susceptible of improvements, all the world will admit. To improve it, I have contributed my mite; which is humbly submitted to the public, a judge from whom there lies no appeal. It is submitted in three views. The first is, Whether an army, modelled as above, would not secure us against the boldest invader; the next, Whether such an army be as dangerous to liberty, as an army in its

“ exercises were continual, which so strengthened the constitution of the men,
 “ that they were always in health. We see no remarks in the Roman authors,
 “ that their armies, in the variety of climates where they made war, ever perished
 “ by disease; whilst now-a-days it is not unusual, that an army, without ever
 “ coming to an engagement, dwindles away by disease in one campaign.”

* *Rei militaris periti, plus quotidiana armorum exercitia ad sanitatem militum putaverunt prodesse, quam medicos. Ex quo intelligitur quanto studiosius armorum artem docendus sit semper exercitus, cum ei laboris consuetudo et in castris sanitatem, et in conflictu possit præstare victoriam. Vegetius, De re militari, lib. 3. cap. 2.* — [In English thus: “ Our masters of the art-military were of opinion,
 “ that daily exercise in arms contributed more to the health of the troops, than
 “ the skill of the physician: from which we may judge, what care should be
 “ taken, to habituate the soldiers to the exercise of arms, to which they owe both
 “ their health in the camp, and their victory in the field.”] — The same author observes, that the Romans in his time had become so inactive, as to leave off the fortifying their camps.

present

present form; and the last, Whether it would not be a school of industry and moderation to our people.

With respect to the first, we should, after a few years, have not only an army of sixty thousand well-disciplined troops, but the command of another army, equally numerous, and equally well disciplined. It is true, that troops inured to war have an advantage over troops that have not the same experience: but with assurance it may be pronounced impracticable, to land at once in Britain an army that can stand against 100,000 British soldiers well disciplined, fighting even their first battle, for their country, and for their wives and children.

A war with France raises a panic on every slight threatening of an invasion. The security afforded by the proposed plan, would enable us to act offensively at sea, instead of being reduced to keep our ships at home, for guarding our coasts. Would Britain any longer be obliged to support her continental connections? No sooner does an European prince augment his army, or improve military discipline, than his neighbours, taking fright, must do the same. May not one hope, that by the plan proposed, or some such, Britain would be relieved from jealousy and solicitude about its neighbours?

With respect to the second view, having long enjoy'd the sweets of a free government, under a succession of mild princes, we begin to forget, that our liberties ever were in danger. But drowsy security is of all conditions the most dangerous; because the state may be overwhelmed before we even dream of danger. Suppose, only, that a British King, accomplished in the art of war, and beloved by his soldiers, heads his own troops in a war with France; and after more than one successful campaign, gives peace to his enemy, on terms advantageous to his people: what security have we for our liberties, when he returns with a victorious army, devoted to his will? I am talking of a standing

army in its present form. Troops modelled as above will not be so obsequious: a number of the prime nobility and gentry serving without pay, who can be under no temptation to enslave themselves and their country, will prove a firm barrier against the ambitious views of such a prince. And even supposing that army to be totally corrupted, the prince can have little hope of success against the nation, supported by another army, composed of men, who, having completed their military service, may be relied on as champions for their country.

And as to the last view mentioned, the plan proposed cannot fail to promote industry and virtue, not only among the soldiers, but among the working people in general. To avoid hard labour and severe discipline in the army, men will be sober and industrious at home; and such untractable spirits as cannot be reached by the mild laws of a free government, will be effectually tamed by military law. At the same time, as sobriety and innocence are constant attendants upon industry, the manners of our people would be much purified; a circumstance of infinite importance to Britain. The salutary influence of the plan, would reach persons in a higher sphere. A young gentleman, whipt at school, or falling behind at college, contracts an aversion to books; and flies to the army, where he is kept in countenance by numbers, idle and ignorant like himself. How many young men are thus daily ruined, who, but for the temptation of idleness and gaiety in the army, would have become useful subjects! In the plan under consideration, the officers who serve for pay would be so few in number, and their prospect of advancement so clear, that it would require much interest to be admitted into the army. None would be admitted but those who have been regularly educated in every branch of military knowledge; and idle boys would be remitted to their studies.

Here is display'd an agreeable scene with relation to industry.

Supposing

Supposing the whole three score thousand men to be absolutely idle; yet, by doubling the industry of those who remain, I affirm, that the sum of industry would be much greater than before. And the scene becomes enchanting, when we consider, that these three score thousand men, would not only be of all the most industrious, but be patterns of industry to others.

Upon conclusion of a foreign war, we suffer grievously by disbanded foldiers, who must plunder or starve. The present plan is an effectual remedy: men accustomed to hard labour under strict discipline, can never be in want of bread: they will be sought for every where, even at higher than ordinary wages; and they will prove excellent masters for training the peasants to hard labour.

A man indulges emulation more freely in behalf of his friend or his country, than of himself: the latter is selfish; the former proceeds from a social principle. In that view, have we not reason to hope, that the separating military officers into different classes, will excite a laudable emulation, prompting individuals to exert themselves on every occasion, for the honour of their corps? Nor will such emulation, a virtuous passion, be any obstruction to private friendship between members of different classes. On the contrary, may it not be expected, that young officers of birth and fortune, zealous to qualify themselves, at their own expence, for serving their country, will cling for instruction to officers of experience, who have no inheritance but personal merit? Both find their account in that connection: men of rank become adepts in military affairs, a valuable branch of education for them; and officers who serve for pay, acquire friends at court, who will embrace every opportunity of testifying their gratitude.

The advantages mentioned are great and extensive; and yet are not the only advantages. Will it be thought extravagant to hope, that

that the proposed plan would form a better system of education for young men of fortune, than hitherto has been known in Britain? Before pronouncing sentence against me, let the following considerations be duly weigh'd. Our youth go abroad to *see* the world in the literal sense; for to pierce deeper than eye-sight, cannot be expected of boys. They resort to gay courts, where they find nothing for imitation but pomp, luxury, dissembled virtues, and real vices: such scenes make a deep impression on young men of a warm imagination. Our plan would be an antidote to such poisonous education. Supposing eighteen to be the earliest time for the army, here is an object held up to our youth of fortune, for rousing their ambition: they will endeavour to make a figure, and emulation will animate them to excel: supposing a young man to have no ambition, shame alone will push him on. To acquire the military art, to discipline their men, to direct the execution of public works, and to conduct other military operations, would occupy their whole time, and banish idleness. A young gentleman, thus guarded against the enticing vices and fauntering follies of youth, must be sadly deficient in genius, if, during his seven years service, reading and reflection have been totally neglected by him. Hoping better things from our youth of fortune, I take for granted, that during their service they have made some progress, not only in military knowledge, but in morals, and in the fine arts, so as at the age of twenty-five to be qualified for profiting, instead of being undone, by *seeing* the world*.

* Whether hereditary nobility may not be necessary, in a monarchical government, to support the King against the multitude, I take not on me to pronounce: but this I pronounce with assurance, that such a constitution is unhappy with respect to education; and appears to admit no remedy, if it be not that above mentioned, or some such. In fact, few of those who received their education while they were the eldest sons of Peers, have been duly qualified to manage public affairs.

Further,

Further, young men of birth and fortune, acquire indeed the smoothness and suppleness of a court, with respect to their superiors; but the constraint of such manners, makes their temper break out against inferiors, where there is no constraint. Insolence of rank is not so visible in Britain, as in countries of less freedom; but it is sufficiently visible to require correction. To that end, no method promises more success than military service; as command and obedience alternately, are the best discipline for acquiring temper and moderation. Can pride and insolence be more effectually stemmed, than to be commanded by an inferior?

Still upon the important article of education. Where pleasure is the ruling passion in youth, interest will be the ruling passion in age: the selfish principle is the foundation of both, the object only is varied. This observation is sadly verified in Britain: our young men of rank, loathing an irksome and fatiguing course of education, abandon themselves to pleasure. Trace these very men through the more sedate part of life, and they will be found grasping at power and profit, by means of court-favour, with no regard to their country, and with very little regard to their friends. The education proposed, holding up a tempting prize to virtuous ambition, is an excellent fence against a life of indolent pleasure. A youth of fortune, engaged with many rivals in a train of public service, acquires a habit of business; and as he is constantly employ'd for the public, patriotism becomes his ruling passion*.

* World
The

* The following portrait is sketched by a good hand, (Madame Pompadour); and if it have any resemblance, it sets our plan in a conspicuous light. The French noblesse, says that lady, spending their lives in dissipation and idleness, know as little of politics as of economy. A gentleman hunts all his life in the country, or

perhaps

The advantages of a military education, such as that proposed, are not yet exhausted: one of considerable importance remains to be unfolded. Under regular government promoting the arts of peace, social intercourse refines, and fondness for company increases in proportion. And hence it is, that the capital is crowded with every person who can afford to live there. A man of fortune, who has no taste but for a city life, happens to be forc'd into the country by business: finding business and the country equally insipid, he becomes impatient, and returns to town, with a disgust at every rural amusement. In France, the country has been long deserted: such fondness for society prevails there, that seldom has the King occasion to inflict a greater punishment on a man of fashion, than to banish him to his country-seat. In Britain the same fondness for a town-life is gaining ground daily. A stranger considering the immense sums expended in England upon country-seats, would conclude, in appearance with great certainty, that the English spend most of their time in the country. But how would it surprise him to be told, not only that people of fashion in England pass little of their time in the country, but that the immense sums laid out upon gardening and pleasure-grounds, are the effect of vanity more than of taste! In fact, such embellishments are beginning to wear out of fashion; appetite for society leaving neither time nor inclination for rural pleasures.

perhaps comes to Paris to ruin himself with an opera-girl. Those who are ambitious to be of the ministry, have seldom any merit, if it be not in caballing and intrigue. The French noblesse have courage, but without any genius for war, the fatigue of a soldier's life being to them unsupportable. The King has been reduced to the necessity of employing two strangers for the safety of his crown: had it not been for the Counts Saxe and Louendahl, the enemies of France might have laid siege to Paris.

If

If the progress of that disease can be stay'd, the only means is military education. In youth lasting impressions are made; and men of fortune who take to the army, being confined mostly to the country in prime of life, contract a liking for country occupations and amusements; which withdraw them from the capital, and contribute to the health of the mind, no less than of the body.

A military education would contribute equally to moderation in social enjoyments. The pomp, ceremony, and expence, necessary to those who adhere to a court, and live always in public, are not a little fatiguing and oppressive. Man is naturally moderate in his desire of enjoyment; and it requires much practice to make him bear excess without satiety and disgust. The pain of excess, prompts men of opulence to pass some part of their time in a snug retirement, where they live at ease, free from pomp and ceremony. Here is a retirement, which can be reached without any painful circuit; a port of safety and of peace, to which we are piloted by military education, avoiding every dangerous rock, and every fatiguing agitation.

Reflecting on the advantages of military education above display'd, is it foolish to think, that our plan might produce a total alteration of manners in our youth of birth and fortune? The idlers, the gamesters, the profligate, compared with our military men, would make a despicable figure: shame, not to talk of pride, would compel them to reform.

How conducive to good government might the proposed plan be, in the hands of a virtuous king, supported by a public-spirited ministry! In the present course of advancement, a youth of quality, who aspires to serve his country in a civil employment, has nothing to rely on but parliamentary interest. The military education proposed, would afford him opportunity to improve his

talents, and to convince the world of his merit. Honour and applause thus acquired, would intitle him to demand preferment; and he ought to be employ'd, not only as deserving, but as an encouragement to others. Frequent instances of neglecting men who are patronized by the public, might perhaps prove dangerous to a British minister.

If I have not all this while been dreaming, here are display'd illustrious advantages of the military education propos'd. Fondness for the subject excites me to prolong the entertainment; and I add the following reflection, on the education of such men as are dispos'd to serve in a public station. The sciences are mutually connected; and a man cannot be perfect in any one, without being in some degree acquainted with every one. The science of politics, in particular, being not a little intricate, cannot be acquired in perfection by any one whose studies have been confined to a single branch, whether relative to peace or to war. The Duke of Marlborough made an eminent figure in the cabinet, as well as in the field; and such was equally the illustrious Sully, who may serve as a model to all ministers. The great aim in modern politics is, to split government into the greatest number possible of departments, trusting nothing to genius. China is a complete model of such a government. National affairs are there so simplified by division, as to require scarce any capacity in the mandarines. These officers, having little occasion for activity, either of mind or of body, sink down into sloth and sensuality: motives of ambition or of fame make no impression: they have not even so much delicacy as to blush when they err: and as they regard no punishment but what touches the person or the purse, it is not unusual to see a mandarine beaten with many stripes, sometimes for a very slight transgression. Let arts be subdivided into many parts; the more subdivisions the better: but I venture to pronounce, that no man ever did, nor ever will, make a capital figure

gure in the government of a state, whether as a judge, a general, or a minister, whose education is rigidly confined to one science*. Sensible am I that the foregoing plan is in several respects imperfect; but if it be found at bottom, polish and improvement are easy operations. My capital aim has been, to obviate the objections that press hard against every military plan, hitherto embraced or proposed. A standing army in its present form, is dangerous to liberty; and but a feeble bulwark against superior force. On the other hand, a nation in which every subject is a foldier, must not indulge any hopes of becoming powerful by manufactures and commerce: it is indeed vigorously defended, but is scarce worthy of being defended. The golden mean of rotation and constant labour in a standing army, would discipline multitudes for peace as well as for war. And a nation so defended would be invincible.

* Phocion is praised by ancient writers, for struggling against an abuse that had crept into his country of Attica, that of making war and politics different professions. In imitation of Aristides and of Pericles, he studied both equally.

E 2

SKETCH

S K E T C H X.

PUBLIC POLICE with respect to the Poor.

AMong those nations of Europe where government is a science, that part of public police which concerns the poor, makes now a considerable branch of statute-law. The poor-laws are so multiplied, and so anxiously framed, as to move one to think, that there cannot remain a single person wanting bread. It is however a sad truth, that the disease of poverty, instead of being eradicated, has become more and more inveterate. England in particular overflows with beggars, tho' in no other country are the indigent so amply provided for. Some radical defect there must be in these laws, when, after endless attempts to perfect them, they all prove abortive. Every writer, dissatisfied with former plans, fails not to produce one of his own; which, in its turn, meets with as little approbation as any of the foregoing.

The first regulation of the states of Holland concerning the poor, was in the year 1614, prohibiting all begging. The next was in the year 1649. "It is enacted, That every town, village, or parish, shall maintain its poor out of the income of its charitable foundations and collections; and in case these means fall short, the magistrates shall maintain them at the general expence of the inhabitants, as can most conveniently be done: Provided always, that the poor be obliged to work either for merchants, farmers, or others, for reasonable wages," in

“ in order that they may, as far as possible, be supported that way ; provided also, that they be indulged in no idleness nor insolence.” The advice or instruction here given to magistrates, is sensible ; but falls short greatly of what may be termed a *law*, the execution of which can be enforced in a court of justice.

In France, the precarious charity of monasteries proving ineffectual, a hospital was erected in the city of Paris *anno* 1656, having different apartments ; one for the innocent poor, one for putting vagabonds to hard labour, one for foundlings, and one for the sick and maimed ; with certain funds for defraying the expence of each, which produce annually much about the same sum. In imitation of Paris, hospitals of the same kind were erected in every great town of the kingdom.

The English began more early to think of their poor ; and in a country without industry, the necessity probably arose more early. The first English statute bears date in the year 1406, directing, “ That every beggar unable to work, shall resort to the hundred where he last dwelt or was born ; and there shall remain, upon pain of being set in the stocks three days and three nights, with only bread and water, and then shall be put out of town.” This was a law against vagrants, for the sake of order. There was little occasion, at that period, to provide for the innocent poor ; their maintenance being a burden upon monasteries. But monasteries being put down by Henry VIII. there was a statute, 22d year of his reign, cap. 12. empowering the justices of every county, to grant licences to poor aged and impotent persons, to beg within a certain district ; those who beg without it, to be whipt, or set in the stocks. In the first year of Edward VI. cap. 3. a statute was made in favour of impotent, maimed, and aged persons, that they shall have convenient houses provided for them, in the cities or towns where they were born, or where they resided for

three

three years, to be relieved by the *willing and charitable disposition* of the parishioners. By 2d and 3d Philip and Mary, cap. 5. the former statutes of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. were confirmed, of gathering weekly relief for the poor by charitable collections. "A man licenced to beg, shall wear a badge on his breast and back openly."

The first compulsory statute was 5^o Elifab. cap. 3. empowering justices of peace to raise a weekly sum for the poor, by taxing such persons as obstinately refuse to contribute, after repeated admonitions from the pulpit. In the next statute, 14^o Elifab. cap. 5. a bolder step was made, empowering justices to tax the inhabitants of every parish, in a weekly sum for their poor. And taxations for the poor being now in some degree familiar, the remarkable statutes, 39^o Elifab. cap. 3. and 43^o Elifab. cap. 2. were enacted, which make the ground-work of all the subsequent statutes concerning the poor. By these statutes, certain householders, named by the justices, are, in conjunction with the church-wardens, appointed overseers for the poor; and these overseers, with consent of two justices, are empowered to tax the parish in what sums they think proper, for maintaining the poor.

Among a people so tenacious of liberty as the English are, and so impatient of oppression, is it not surprising, to find a law, that, without ceremony, subjects individuals to the arbitrary will of men, who seldom either by birth or education deserve that important trust; and without even providing any effectual check against embezzlement? At present, a British parliament would reject with scorn such an absurd plan; and yet, being familiarized to it, they never seriously have attempted a repeal. We have been always on the watch to prevent the sovereign's encroachments, especially with regard to taxes: but as parish-officers are low persons who inspire no dread, we submit to have our pockets pick'd by them, almost without repining. There is provided, it is true,

an

an appeal to the general sessions for redressing inequalities in taxing the parishioners; but it is no effectual remedy; artful overseers will not over-rate any man so grossly as to make it his interest to complain, considering that these overseers have the poor's money to defend themselves with. Nor will the general sessions readily listen to a complaint, that cannot be verified but with much time and trouble. If the appeal have any effect, it will make a still greater inequality, by relieving men of figure at the expence of their inferiors; who must submit, having little interest to obtain redress.

The English plan, beside being oppressive, is grossly unjust. If it should be reported of some distant nation, that the burden of maintaining the idle and profligate, is laid upon the frugal and industrious, who work hard for a maintenance to themselves; what would one think of such a nation? Yet this is literally the case of England. I say more: the plan is not only oppressive and unjust, but miserably defective in the checking of maladministration. In fact, great sums are levied beyond what the poor receive: it requires braving to be named a church-warden: the nomination, in London especially, gives him credit at once; and however meagre at the commencement of his office, he is round and plump before it ends. To wax fat and rich by robbing the poor! Let us turn our eyes from a scene so horrid*.

* In the parish of St George, Hanover Square, a great reform was made some years ago. Inhabitants of figure, not excepting men of the highest rank, take it in turn to be church-wardens; which has reduced the poor-rates in that parish to a trifle. But people, after acquiring a name, soon tire of drudging for others. The drudgery will be left to low people as formerly, and the tax will again rise as high in that parish as in others. The poor-rates, in Dr Davenant's time, were about L. 700,000 yearly: at present they amount to between two and three millions.

Inequality

Inequality in taxing, and embezzlement of the money levied, which are notorious, poison the minds of the people; and impress them with a notion, that all taxes raised by public authority are ill managed.

These evils are great, and yet are but slight compared with what follow. As the number of poor in England, as well as the expence of maintenance, are increasing daily, proprietors of land, in order to be relieved of a burden so grievous, drive the poor out of the parish, and prevent all persons from settling in it who are likely to become a burden: cottages are demolished, and marriage obstructed. Influenced by the present evil, they look not forward to depopulation, nor to the downfall of husbandry and manufactures by scarcity of hands. Every parish is in a state of war with every other parish, concerning pauper settlements and removals.

The price of labour is generally the same in the different shires of Scotland, and in the different parishes. A few exceptions are occasioned by the neighbourhood of a great town, or by some extensive manufacture that requires many hands. In Scotland, the price of labour resembles water, which always levels itself: if high in any one corner, an influx of hands brings it down. The price of labour varies in every parish of England. A labourer who has gain'd a settlement in a parish, on which he depends for bread when he inclines to be idle, dares not remove to another parish where wages are higher, fearing to be cut out of a settlement altogether. England is in the same condition with respect to labour, that France lately was with respect to corn; which, however plentiful in one province, could not be exported to supply the wants of another. The pernicious effects of the latter with respect to food, are not more obvious, than of the former with respect to manufactures.

English manufactures labour under a still greater hardship than inequality of wages. In a country where there is no fund for the

poor

poor but what nature provides, the labourer must be satisfied with such wages as are customary: he has no resource; for pity is not moved by idleness. In England, the labourers command the market: if not satisfied with customary wages, they have an excellent resource; which is, to abandon work altogether, and to put themselves on the parish. Labour is much cheaper in France than in England: I have heard several plausible reasons; but in my opinion, the difference arises from the poor-laws. In England, every man is entitled to be idle; and every idler is entitled to a maintenance. In France, the funds appropriated to the poor, yield the same sum annually: that sum is always preoccupied; and France, with respect to all but those on the list, approaches to the state of a nation that has no fund provided by law for the poor.

Depopulation, inequality in the price of labour, and extravagant wages, are deplorable evils. But the English poor-laws are productive of evils still more deplorable: they are subversive both of morality and industry. This is a heavy charge, but no less true than heavy. Fear of want is the only effectual motive to industry with the labouring poor: remove that fear, and they cease to be industrious. The ruling passion of those who live by bodily labour, is to save a pittance for their children, and for supporting themselves in old age: stimulated by desire of accomplishing these ends, they are frugal and industrious; and the prospect of success is to them a continual feast. Now what worse can malice invent against such a man, under colour of friendship, than to secure bread to him and his children whenever he takes a dislike to work; which effectually deadens his sole ambition, and with it his honest industry? Relying on the certainty of a provision against want, he relaxes gradually till he sink into idleness: idleness leads to profligacy: profligacy begets diseases: and the wretch becomes an object of public charity before he has run half his course. Such are the genuine effects of the English tax for the poor, un-

der a mistaken notion of charity. There never was known in any country, a scheme for the poor more contradictory to sound policy. Might it not have been foreseen, that to a groveling creature, who has no sense of honour, and scarce any of shame, the certainty of maintenance would prove an irresistible temptation to idleness and debauchery? The poor-house at Lyons contained originally but forty beds, of which twenty only were occupied. The eight hundred beds it contains at present, are not sufficient for the poor who demand admittance. A premium is not more successful in any case, than where it is given to promote idleness. A house for the poor was erected in a French village, the revenue of which, by economy, became considerable. Upon a representation by the curate of the parish, that more beds were necessary, the proprietor undertook the management. He sold the house, with the furniture; and to every proper object of charity, he ordered a moderate proportion of bread and beef. The poor and sick were more comfortably lodged at home, than formerly in the poor-house. And by that plan of management, the parish-poor decreased, instead of increasing, as at Lyons. How few English manufacturers labour the whole week, if the work of four or five days afford them maintenance? Is not this a demonstration, that the malady of idleness is widely spread? In Bristol, the parish-poor twenty years ago did not exceed four thousand: at present, they amount to more than ten thousand. But as a malady, when left to itself, commonly effectuates its own cure; so it will happen in this case: when, by prevailing idleness, every one without shame claims parish-charity, the burden will become intolerable, and the poor will be left to their shifts.

The immoral effects of public charity are not confined to those who depend on it, but extend to their children. The constant anxiety of a labouring man to provide for his children, endears them to him. Being relieved of that anxiety by the tax for the poor;

poor, his affection cools gradually, and he turns at last perfectly indifferent about them. Their independence, on the other hand, weans them from their duty to him. And thus, affection between parent and child, which is the corner-stone of society, is in a great measure obliterated among the labouring poor. In a plan published by the Earl of Hillsborough, there is an article, obliging parents to maintain their indigent children, and children to maintain their indigent parents. Natural affection must indeed be at a low ebb, where such a regulation is necessary: but it is necessary, at least in London, where it is common to see men in good business neglecting their aged and diseased parents, for no better reason, than that the parish is bound to find them bread: *Prob tempora, prob mores!*

The immoral effects of public charity spread still wider. It fails not to extinguish the virtue of charity among the rich; who never think of giving charity, when the public undertakes for all. In a scheme published by Mr Hay, one article is, to raise a stock for the poor by voluntary contributions, and to make up the deficiency by a parish-tax. Will individuals ever contribute, when it is not to relieve the poor, but to relieve the parish? Every hospital has a poor-box, which seldom produces any thing*. The great comfort of society is assistance in time of need; and its firmest cement is, the bestowing and receiving kindly offices, especially in distress. Now to unhinge or suspend the exercise of charity, by rendering it unnecessary, relaxes every social virtue, by supplanting the chief of them. The consequence is dismal: exercise of benevolence to the distressed is our surest guard against

* One exception I am fond to mention. The poor-box of the Edinburgh infirmary was neglected two or three years, little being expected from it. When opened, L. 74 was found in it; beside a few shillings and halfpence, contributed probably by the lower sort, who were ashamed to give their mite publicly.

the encroachments of selfishness: if that guard be withdrawn, selfishness will prevail, and become the ruling passion. In fact, the tax for the poor has contributed greatly to the growth of that groveling passion, so conspicuous at present in England.

English authors who turn their thoughts to the poor, make heavy complaints of decaying charity, and increasing poverty: never once dreaming, that these are the genuine effects of a legal provision for the poor; which on the one hand eradicates the virtue of charity, and on the other is a violent temptation to idleness. Wonderfully ill contrived must the English charity-laws be, when their consequences are to sap the foundation of voluntary charity; to deprive the labouring poor of their chief comfort, that of providing for themselves and children; to relax mutual affection between parent and child; and to reward, instead of punishing, idleness and vice. Consider whether a legal provision for the poor, be sufficient to atone for so many evils.

No man had better opportunity than Fielding to be acquainted with the state of the poor: let us listen to him. "That the poor
"are a very great burden, and even a nuisance to the kingdom;
"that the laws for relieving their distresses, and restraining their
"vices, have not answered; and that they are at present very ill
"provided for, and much worse governed, are truths which e-
"very one will acknowledge. Every person who hath property,
"must feel the weight of the tax that is levied for the poor; and
"every person of understanding, must see how absurdly it is ap-
"plied. So useless indeed is this heavy tax, and so wretched its dis-
"position, that it is a question, whether the poor or rich are actu-
"ally more dissatisfied, since the plunder of the one serves so little
"to the real advantage of the other; for while a million yearly is
"raised among the rich, many of the poor are starved; many more
"languish in want and misery; of the rest, numbers are found
"begging or pilfering in the streets to-day, and to-morrow are
"locked

“locked up in gaols and Bridewells. If we were to make a progress through the outskirts of the metropolis, and look into the habitations of the poor, we should there behold such pictures of human misery, as must move the compassion of every heart that deserves the name of human. What indeed must be his composition, who could see whole families in want of every necessary of life, oppressed with hunger, cold, nakedness, and filth; and with diseases, the certain consequence of all these! The sufferings indeed of the poor are less known than their misdeeds; and therefore we are less apt to pity them. They starve, and freeze, and rot, among themselves; but they beg, and steal, and rob, among their betters. There is not a parish in the liberty of Westminster, which doth not raise thousands annually for the poor; and there is not a street in that liberty, which doth not swarm all day with beggars, and all night with thieves.”

There is not a single beggar to be seen in Pennsylvania. Luxury and idleness have got no footing in that happy country; and those who suffer by misfortune, have their maintenance out of the public treasury. But luxury and idleness cannot for ever be excluded; and when they take place, this regulation will be as pernicious in Pennsylvania, as the poor-rates are in Britain.

Of the many proposals that have been published for reforming the poor-laws, not one has pierced to the root of the evil. None of the authors entertain the slightest doubt, of a legal provision being necessary, tho’ all our distresses arise evidently from that very cause. Travellers complain, of being infested with an endless number of beggars in every English town; a very different scene from what they meet with in Holland or Switzerland. How would it surprise them to be told, that this proceeds from an overflow of charity in the good people of England?

Few institutions are more ticklish than those of charity. In London,

don, common prostitutes are treated with singular humanity : a hospital for them when pregnant, disburdens them of their load, and nurses them till they be again fit for business : another hospital cures them of the venereal disease : and a third receives them with open arms, when, instead of desire, they become objects of averfion. Would not one imagine, that these hospitals have been erected for encouraging prostitution ? They undoubtedly have that effect, tho' far from being intended. Mr Stirling, superintendant of the Edinburgh poor-house, deserves to be kept in perpetual remembrance, for a scheme he contrived to reform common prostitutes. A number of them were confined in a house of correction, on a daily allowance of three pence ; and even part of that small pittance was embezzled by the servants of the house. Pinching hunger did not reform their manners ; for being absolutely idle, they encouraged each other in vice, waiting impatiently for the hour of deliverance. Mr Stirling, with consent of the magistrates, removed them to a clean house ; and instead of money, which is apt to be squandered, appointed for each a pound of oat-meal daily, with salt, water, and fire for cooking. Relieved now from distress, they longed for comfort : what would they not give for milk or ale ? Work, says he, will procure you plenty. To some who offered to spin, he gave flax and wheels, engaging to pay them half the price of their yarn, retaining the other half for the materials furnished. The spinners earned about nine pence weekly, a comfortable addition to what they had before. The rest undertook to spin, one after another ; and before the end of the first quarter, they were all of them intent upon work. It was a branch of his plan, to set free such as merited that favour ; and some of them appeared so thoroughly reformed, as to be in no danger of a relapse.

The ingenious author of *The Police of France*, who wrote in the year 1753, observes, that notwithstanding the plentiful provision for

for the poor in that kingdom, mentioned above, there was a general complaint, of the increase of beggars and vagrants; and adds, that the French political writers, dissatisfied with their own plan, had presented several memorials to the ministry, proposing to adopt the English parochial assessments, as greatly preferable. This is a curious fact; for at the very same time people in London, no less dissatisfied with these assessments, were writing pamphlets in praise of the French hospitals. One thing is certain, that no plan hitherto invented has given satisfaction. Whether an unexceptionable plan is at all possible, seems extremely doubtful.

In every plan for the poor that I have seen, workhouses make one article; to provide work for those who are willing, and to make those work who are unwilling. With respect to the former, men need never be idle in England for want of employment; and they always succeed the best at the employment they chuse for themselves. With respect to the latter, punishment will not compel a man to labour seriously: he may assume the appearance, but will make no progress; and the pretext of sickness or weakness is ever at hand for an excuse. The only compulsion to make a man work seriously, is fear of want.

A hospital for the sick, for the wounded, and for the maimed, is an excellent establishment; being productive of good, without doing any harm. Such a hospital should depend partly on voluntary charity; to procure which a general conviction of its being well managed, is necessary. Hospitals that have a sufficient fund of their own, and that have no dependence on the good will of others, are commonly ill managed.

Lies there any objection against a workhouse, for training to labour destitute orphans, and begging children? It is an article in Mr Hay's plan, that the workhouse should relieve poor families of all their children above three. This has an enticing appearance,

but

but is unsound at bottom. Children require the tenderness of a mother, during the period of infantine diseases; and even after that period, they are far from being safe in the hands of mercenaries, who study nothing but their own ease and interest. Would it not be better, to distribute small sums from time to time among poor families overburdened with children, so as to relieve them from famine, not from labour? And with respect to orphans and begging children, I incline to think, that it would be a more salutary measure, to encourage mechanicks, manufacturers, and farmers above all, to educate such children. A premium for each, the half in hand, and the other half when they can work for themselves, would be a proper encouragement. The best-regulated orphan-hospital I am acquainted with, is that of Edinburgh. Orphans are taken in from every corner, provided only they be not under the age of seven, nor above that of twelve: under seven, they are too tender for a hospital; above twelve, their relations can find employment for them. Beside the being taught to read and write, they are carefully instructed in some art, that may afford them comfortable subsistence.

No man ever called in question the utility of the marine society; which will reflect honour on the members as long as we have a navy to protect us: they deserve a rank above that of gartered knights. That institution is the noblest exertion of charity and patriotism, that ever was known in any country.

A sort of hospital for servants who for twenty years have faithfully adhered to the same master, would be much to my taste; with a few adjoining acres for a kitchen-garden. The fund for purchasing, building, and maintenance, must be raised by contribution; and none but the contributors should be entitled to offer servants to the house. By such encouragement, a malady would be remedied, that of wandering from master to master for better wages, or easier service, which seldom fails to corrupt servants.

vants. They ought to be comfortably provided for, adding to the allowance of the house what pot-herbs are raised by their own labour. A number of virtuous men thus associated, would end their days in comfort; and the prospect of attaining a settlement so agreeable, would form excellent servants. How advantageous would such a hospital prove to husbandry in particular?

Of all the mischiefs that have been engendered by over-anxiety about the poor, none have proved more fatal than foundling-hospitals. They tend to cool affection for children, still more effectually than the English parish-charity. At every occasional pinch for food, away goes a child to the hospital; and parental affection among the lower sort turns so languid, that many who are in no pinch, relieve themselves of trouble by the same means. It is affirmed, that of the children born annually in Paris, about a third part are sent to the foundling-hospital. The Paris almanack for the year 1768, mentions, that there were baptized 18,576 infants; of whom the foundling-hospital received 6025. The proportion originally was much less; but vice creeps on with a swift pace. How enormous must be the degeneracy of the Parisian populace, and their want of parental affection!

Let us next turn to infants shut up in this hospital. Of all animals, infants of the human race are the weakest: they require a mother's affection to guard them against numberless diseases and accidents; a wise appointment of Providence to connect parents and children in the strictest union. In a foundling-hospital, there is no fond mother to watch over her tender babe; and the hireling nurse has no fondness but for her own little profit. Need we any other cause for the destruction of infants in a foundling-hospital, much greater in proportion than of those under the care of a mother? And yet there is another cause equally potent, which is corrupted air. What Hanway observes upon parish-workhouses, is equally applicable to a foundling-hospital.

"To attempt," says he, "to nourish an infant in a workhouse, where a number of nurses are congregated into one room, and consequently the air become putrid, I will pronounce, from intimate knowledge of the subject, to be but a small remove from slaughter; *for the child must die.*" Down then with foundling-hospitals, more noxious than pestilence or famine. An infant exposed at the door of a dwelling-house, must be taken up: but in that case, which seldom happens, the infant has a better chance for life with a hired nurse than in a hospital; and a chance perhaps little worse, bad as it is, than with an unnatural mother. I approve not indeed of a quarterly payment to such a nurse: would it not do better to furnish her bare maintenance for three years; and if the child be alive at that time, to give her a handsome addition?

A house of correction is necessary for good order; but belongs not to the present essay, which concerns maintenance of the poor, not punishment of vagrants. I shall only by the way borrow a thought from Fielding, that fasting is the proper punishment of profligacy, not any punishment that is attended with shame. Punishment, he observes, that deprives a man of all sense of honour, never will contribute to make him virtuous.

Charity-schools might have been proper, when few could read, and fewer write; but these arts are now so common, that in most families children may be taught to read at home, and to write in a private school at little expence. Charity-schools at present are more hurtful than beneficial: young persons who continue there so long as to read and write fluently, become too delicate for hard labour, and too proud for ordinary labour. Knowledge is a dangerous acquisition to the labouring poor: the more of it that is possessed by a shepherd, a ploughman, or any drudge, the less fitted is he to labour with content. The only plausible argument for a charity-school, is, "That children of the labouring poor are

"taught

“taught there the principles of religion and of morality, which they cannot acquire at home.” The argument would be invincible, if without education we could have no knowledge of these principles. But Providence has not left man in a state so imperfect: the principles of theology and of morality are stamped on his heart; and none can be ignorant of them, who attend to their own perceptions. Education is indeed of use to ripen such perceptions; and it is of singular use to those who have time for reading and thinking: but education in a charity-school is so slight, as to render it doubtful, whether it be not more hurtful by fostering laziness, than advantageous by conveying instruction. The natural impressions of religion and morality, if not obscured by vicious habits, are sufficient for good conduct: preserve a man from vice by constant labour, and he will not be deficient in his duty either to God or to man. Hesiod, an ancient and respectable poet, says, that God hath placed labour as a guard to virtue. More integrity accordingly will be found among a number of industrious poor taken at random, than among the same number in any other class.

I heartily approve every regulation that tends to prevent idleness. Chief Justice Hale says, “That prevention of poverty and idleness would do more good than all the gibbets, whipping-posts, and gaols in the kingdom.” In that view, gaming-houses ought to be heavily taxed, as well as horse-racing, cock-fighting, and all meetings that encourage idleness. The admitting low people to vote for members of parliament, is a source of idleness, corruption, and poverty. The same privilege is ruinous to every small parliament-borough. Nor have I any difficulty to pronounce, that the admitting the populace to vote in the election of a minister, a frequent practice in Scotland, is productive of the same pernicious effects.

What then is to be the result of the foregoing enquiry? Is it from defect of invention that a good legal establishment for the

poor is not yet discovered? or is it impracticable to make any legal establishment that is not fraught with corruption? I incline to the latter, for the following reasons, no less obvious than solid. That in a legal establishment for the poor, no distinction can be made between virtue and vice; and consequently that every such establishment must be a premium for idleness. And where is the necessity, after all, of any public establishment? By what unhappy prejudice have people been led to think, that the Author of our nature, so beneficent to his favourite man in every other respect, has abandoned the indigent to famine and death, if municipal law interpose not? We need but inspect the human heart to be convinced, that persons in distress are his peculiar care. Not only has he made it our duty to afford them relief, but has superadded the passion of pity to enforce the performance of that duty. This branch of our nature fulfils in perfection all the salutary purposes of charity, without admitting any one of the deplorable evils that a legal provision is fraught with. The contrivance, at the same time, is extremely simple: it leaves to every man the objects as well as measure of his charity. No man esteems it a duty to relieve wretches reduced to poverty by idleness and profligacy: they move not our pity; nor do they expect any good from us. Wisely therefore is it ordered by Providence, that charity should in every respect be voluntary, to prevent the idle and profligate from depending on it for support.

This plan is in many respects excellent. The exercise of charity, when free from compulsion, is extremely pleasant. The pleasure, it is true, is scarce felt where charity is rendered unnecessary by municipal law; but were that law laid aside, the gratification of pity would become one of our sweetest pleasures. Charity, like other affections, is invigorated by exercise, and no less enfeebled by disuse. Providence withal hath scattered benevolence among the sons of men with a liberal hand: and notwithstanding

standing the obstruction of municipal law, seldom is there found one so obdurate, as to resist the impulse of compassion, when a proper object is presented. In a well regulated government, promoting industry and virtue, the persons who need charity are not many; and such persons may, with assurance, depend on the charity of their neighbours.*

It may, at the same time, be boldly affirmed, that those who need charity, would be more comfortably provided for by the plan of Providence, than by any legal establishment. Creatures, loathsome by disease or nastiness, affect the air in a poor-house, and have little chance for life, without more care and kindness, than can be hoped from servants, rendered callous by continual scenes of misery. Consider, on the other hand, the consequences of voluntary charity, equally agreeable to the giver and receiver. The kindly connection it forms between them, grows stronger and stronger by reiteration; and squalid poverty, far from being an obstruction, excites a degree of pity, proportioned to the distress. It may happen for a wonder, that an indigent person is overlooked; but for one who will suffer by such neglect, multitudes suffer by compelled charity.

But what I insist on with peculiar satisfaction is, that natural charity is an illustrious support to virtue. Indigent virtue can never fail of relief, because it never fails to enflame compassion. Indigent vice, on the contrary, raises indignation more than pity (a); and therefore can have little prospect of relief. What a

* The Italians are not more remarkable for a charitable disposition, than their neighbours. No fewer however than seventy thousand mendicant friars live there upon voluntary charity; and I have not heard that any one of them ever died of want.

(a) Elements of Criticism, chap. 2. part 7.

glorious

glorious excitement to industry and virtue, and how discouraging to idleness and vice! Lamentable it is, that so beautiful a structure should be razed to the ground by municipal law, which, in providing for the poor, makes no distinction between virtue and vice. The execution of the poor-laws would indeed be impracticable, were such a distinction attempted by enquiring into the conduct and character of every *pauper*. Where are judges to be found who will patiently follow out such a dark and intricate explication? To accomplish the task, a man must abandon every other concern.

In the first English statutes mentioned above, the legislature appear carefully to have avoided compulsory charity: every measure for promoting voluntary charity was first try'd, before the fatal blow was struck, empowering parish-officers to impose a tax for the poor. The legislature certainly did not foresee the baneful consequences: but how came they not to see that they were distrusting Providence, declaring in effect, that the plan established by our Maker for the poor, is insufficient? Many are the municipal laws that enforce the laws of nature, by additional rewards and punishments; but it was singularly bold to abolish the natural law of charity, by establishing a legal tax in its stead. Men will always be mending: what a confused jumble do they make, when they attempt to mend the laws of Nature! Leave Nature to her own operations: she understands them the best.

Few regulations are more plausible than what are political; and yet few are more deceitful. An ingenious writer makes the following observations upon the 43^o Elis. establishing a maintenance for the poor. "Laws have been enacted in many other countries, which have punished the idle beggar, and exhorted the rich to extend their charity to the poor: but it is peculiar to the humanity of England, to have made their support a matter of obligation and necessity on the more wealthy. The English

"lish

"lish seem to be the first nation in Europe in science, arts, and
 "arms: they likewise are possessed of the freest and most perfect
 "of constitutions, and the blessings consequential to that free-
 "dom. If virtues in an individual are sometimes supposed to be
 "rewarded in this world, I do not think it too presumptuous to
 "suppose, that national virtues may likewise meet with their re-
 "ward. England hath, to its peculiar honour, not only made
 "their poor free, but hath provided a certain and solid establish-
 "ment to prevent their necessities and indigence, when they a-
 "rise from what the law calls *the act of God*: and are not these
 "beneficent and humane attentions to the miseries of our fellow-
 "creatures, the first of those poor pleas which we are capable of
 "offering, in behalf of our imperfections, to an all-wise and
 "merciful Creator!" To this writer, who shows more zeal than
 knowledge, I oppose another, whose reflections are more rational.
 "In England, there is an act of the legislature, obliging every
 "parish to maintain its own poor. Scarce any man living, who
 "has not seen the effects of this law, but must approve of it; and
 "yet such are its effects, that the streets of London are filled
 "with objects of misery beyond what is seen in any other city.
 "The labouring poor, depending on this law to be provided in
 "sickness and old age, are little solicitous to save, and become
 "habitually profuse. The principle of charity is established by
 "Providence in the human heart, for relieving those who are dis-
 "abled to work for themselves. And if the labouring poor had
 "no dependence but on the principle of charity, they would be
 "more religious; and if they were influenced by religion, they
 "would be less abandoned in their behaviour. Thus this seem-
 "ing-good act turns to a national evil: there is more distress a-
 "mong the poor in London than any where in Europe; and
 "more drunkenness both in males and females (a)."

(a) Author of Angeloni's letters.

I am aware, that during the reign of Elifabeth, some compulsion might be necessary to preserve the poor from starving. Henry VIII. had sequestered all the hospitals, a hundred and ten in number, and squandered their revenues; he had also demolished all the abbeys. By these means, the poor were reduced to a miserable condition; especially as private charity, for want of exercise, was at a low ebb. That critical juncture required indeed help from the legislature: and a temporary provision for the poor would have been a proper measure; so contrived as not to supersede voluntary charity, but rather to promote it. Unlucky it is for England, that such a measure was overlooked; but Queen Elifabeth and her parliaments had not the talent of foreseeing consequences without the aid of experience. A perpetual tax for the poor was imposed, the most pernicious tax that ever was imposed in any country.

With respect to the present times, the reason now given pleads against abolishing at once a legal provision for the poor. It may be taken for granted, that charity is in England not more vigorous at present, than it was in the days of Elifabeth. Would our ministry but lead the way, by showing some zeal for a reformation, expedients would probably be invented, for supporting the poor, without unhinging voluntary charity. The following expedient is proposed, merely as a specimen. Let a tax be imposed by parliament on every parish for their poor, variable in proportion to the number; but not to exceed the half of what is necessary; and directing the landholders to make up quarterly, a list of the names and condition of such persons as in their opinion need charity; with an estimate of what each ought to have weekly. The public tax makes the half, and the other half is to be raised by voluntary contribution. To prevent collusion, the roll of the poor, and their weekly appointment, with a subscription of gentlemen for their part of the sum, shall be examined by the justices

justices of peace at a quarterly meeting; who, on receiving satisfaction, must order the sum arising from the public tax to be distributed among the poor contained in the roll, according to the estimate of the landholders. As the public fund lies dead till the subscription is completed, it is not to be imagined, that any gentleman will stand out: it would be a public imputation on his character. Far from apprehending any deficiency, confident I am, that every gentleman would consider it as honourable to contribute largely. This agreeable work must be blended with what is rather disagreeable, that of excluding from the roll every profligate, male or female. If that rule be followed out with a proper degree of severity, the innocent poor will diminish daily; so as in time to be safely left upon voluntary charity, without necessity of any tax.

But must miserable wretches, reduced to poverty by idleness or intemperance, be, in a Christian country, abandoned to diseases and famine? It is this very argument, shallow as it is, that has corrupted the industry of England, and reduced multitudes to diseases and famine. Those who are able to work, may be locked up in a house of correction, to be fed with bread and water, but with liberty of working for themselves. And as for the remainder, their case is not desperate, when they have access to such tender-hearted persons as are more eminent for pity than for principle. If by neglect or oversight any happen to die of want, the example will tend more to reformation, than the most pathetic discourse from the pulpit.

Even at the hazard of losing a few lives by neglect or oversight, common begging ought absolutely to be prohibited. The most profligate, are the most impudent, and the most expert at feigning distress. If begging be indulged to any, all will rush into the public: idlers are fond of that wandering and indolent sort of life; and there is no temptation to idleness more successful, than liberty

to beg. In order to be relieved from common beggars, it has been proposed, to fine those who give them alms. Little penetration must they have, to whom the insufficiency of such a remedy is not palpable. It is easy to give alms without being seen; and compassion will extort alms, even at the hazard of suffering for it; not to mention, that every one in such a case will avoid the odious character of an informer. The following remedy is suggested, as what probably may answer better. An officer must be appointed in every parish, with a competent salary, for apprehending and carrying to the workhouse every strolling beggar; under the penalty of losing his office, with what salary is due to him, if any beggar be found strolling four and twenty hours after the fact comes to his knowledge. In the workhouse such beggars shall be fed with bread and water for a year, but with liberty of working for themselves.

I declare resolutely against a perpetual tax for the poor. But if there must be such a tax, I know of none less subversive of industry and morals, than that established in Scotland, obliging the landholders in every parish to meet at stated times, in order to provide a fund for the poor; but leaving the objects of their charity, and the measure, to their own humanity and discretion. In this plan, there is no encroachment on the natural duty of charity, but only that the minority must submit to the opinion of the majority.

In large towns, where the character and circumstances of the poor are not so well known as in country-parishes, the following variation is proposed. Instead of landholders, who are proper in country-parishes, let there be in each town-parish a standing committee, to be chosen by the proprietors of houses, the third part to be changed annually. This committee, with the minister, make up a list of such as deserve charity, adding an estimate of what, with their own labour, may be sufficient for each of them. The minister,

nister, with one or two of the committee, carry about this list to every family that can afford charity, suggesting what may be proper for each to contribute. This list, with an addition of the sum contributed or promised by each householder, must be affixed on the principal door of the parish-church, to honour the contributors, and to inform the poor of the provision made for them. Some such mode may probably be effectual, without transgressing the bounds of voluntary charity. But if any one obstinately refuse to contribute after several applications, the committee at their discretion may tax him. If it be the possessor who declines contributing, the tax must be laid upon him, reserving relief against his landlord.

In great towns, the poor, who ought to be prohibited from begging, are less known than in country-parishes. And among a croud of inhabitants, it is easier for an individual to escape the eye of the public, when he with-holds charity, than in country-parishes. Both defects will be remedied by the plan above proposed: it will bring to light, in great cities, the poor who deserve charity; and it will bring to light every person who with-holds charity.

In large towns, where the character and circumstances of the poor are not so well known as in country-parishes, the following variation is proposed. Instead of landholders, who are proper in country-parishes, let there be in each town-parish a standing committee, to be chosen by the proprietors of houses, the third part to be changed annually. This committee, with the minister, make up a list of such as deserve charity, adding an estimate of what, with their own labour, may be sufficient for each of them. The minister

H. 2.

SKETCH

S K E T C H XI.

A GREAT CITY considered in Physical, Moral, and Political Views.

IN all ages an opinion seems to have been prevalent, that a great city is a great evil, and that a capital may be too great for the state, as a head may be for the body. Considering however the very shallow reasons that have been given for this opinion, it should seem to be but slightly founded. There are several ordinances limiting the extent of Paris, and prohibiting new buildings beyond the prescribed bounds; the first of which is by Henry II. ann. 1549. These ordinances have been renewed from time to time, down to the 1672, in which year there is an edict of Louis XIV. to the same purpose. The reasons assigned are, "First, That by enlarging the city, the air would be rendered unwholesome. Second, That cleaning the streets would prove a great additional labour. Third, That adding to the number of inhabitants would raise the price of provisions, of labour, and of manufactures. Fourth, That ground would be covered with buildings instead of corn, which might hazard a scarcity. Fifth, That the country would be depopulated by the desire that people have to resort to the capital. And, lastly, That the difficulty of governing such numbers would be an encouragement to robbery and murder."

These reasons for confining the city of Paris within certain bounds are wonderfully shallow. The most important of them conclude

conclude justly against permitting an increase of inhabitants: the second and fourth conclude only against enlarging the city; and these, at the best, are trifling. The first reason urged against enlarging the city, is a solid reason for enlarging it, supposing the numbers to be limited; for to prevent crowding is an excellent preventive of unwholesome air. Paris, with the same number of inhabitants that were in the days of the fourth Henry, occupies thrice the space, much to the health as well as comfort of the inhabitants. Had the ordinances mentioned been made effectual, the houses in Paris must all have been built, like those in the old town, story above story, ascending to the sky like the tower of Babel. Before the great fire *anno* 1666, the plague was frequent in London; but by widening the streets, and enlarging the houses, there has not since been known in that great city, any contagious distemper that deserves the name of a plague. The third, fifth, and last reasons, conclude against permitting any addition to the number of inhabitants; but conclude nothing against enlarging the town. In a word, the measure adopted in these ordinances has little or no tendency to correct the evils complained of; and infallibly would enflame the chief of them. The measure that ought to have been adopted, is to limit the number of inhabitants, not the extent of the town.

Queen Elisabeth of England, copying the French ordinances, issued a proclamation *anno* 1602, prohibiting any new buildings within three miles of London. The preamble is in the following words: "That foreseeing the great and manifold inconveniencies
"and mischiefs, which daily grow, and are likely to increase, in
"the city and suburbs of London, by confluence of people to inhabit the same; not only by reason that such multitudes can
"hardly be governed to serve God, and obey her Majesty, without constituting an addition of new officers, and enlarging their
"authority; but also can hardly be provided of food and other
"necessaries

“ necessities at a reasonable price ; and finally, that as such mul-
“ titudes of people, many of them poor, who must live by beg-
“ ging, or worse means, are heaped up together, and in a fort
“ smothered, with many children and servants, in one house or
“ small tenement ; it must needs follow, if any plague or other
“ universal sickness come amongst them, that it would presently
“ spread through the whole city and confines, and also into all
“ parts of the realm.”

There appears no deeper penetration in this proclamation, than in the French ordinances. The same error is observable in both, which is the limiting the extent of the town, instead of limiting the number of inhabitants. True it is indeed, that the regulation would have a better effect in London than in Paris. As stone is in plenty about Paris, houses there may be carried to a very great height ; and are actually so carried in the old town : but there being no stone about London, the houses formerly were built of timber, now of brick ; materials too frail for a lofty edifice.

Proceeding to particulars, the first objection, which is the expence of governing a great multitude, concludes against the numbers, not against the extent of the city. At the same time, the objection is at best doubtful in point of fact. Tho' vices abound in a great city, requiring the strictest attention of the magistrate ; yet with a well-regulated police, it is much less expensive to govern 600,000 in one city, than the same number in ten different cities. The second objection, viz. the high price of provisions, strikes only against numbers, not extent. Beside, whatever might have been the case in the days of Elisabeth, when agriculture and internal commerce were in their infancy ; there are at present not many towns in England, where a temperate man may live cheaper than in London. The hazard of contagious distempers, which is the third objection, is an invincible argument against limiting the extent of a great town. It is mentioned above, that from the

year

year 1666, when the streets were widened, and the houses enlarged, London has never been once visited by the plague. If the proclamation had taken effect, the houses must have been so crowded upon each other, and the streets so contracted, as to have occasioned plagues still more frequently than before the year 1666.

The ministry of the Queen's immediate successors were not more clear-sighted than she and her ministers were. In the year 1624, King James issued a proclamation against building in London upon new foundations. Charles I. issued two proclamations to the same purpose; one in the year 1625, and one in the year 1630.

The progress of political knowledge has unfolded many bad effects of a great city, more weighty than any urged in these proclamations. The first I shall mention is, that people born and bred in a great city are commonly weak and effeminate. Vegetius (a) observing, that men bred to husbandry make the best soldiers, adds what follows. "Interdum tamen necessitas exigit, et iam urbanos ad arma compelli: qui ubi nomen dedere militiæ, primum laborare, decurrere, portare pondus, et solem pulveremque ferre, condiscant; parco victu utantur et rustico; interdum sub divo, interdum sub papilionibus, commorentur. Tunc demum ad usum erudiantur armorum: et si longior expeditio emergit, in angariis plurimum detinendi sunt, proculque habendi a civitatis illecebris: ut eo modo, et corporibus eorum robur accedat, et animis*." The luxury of a great city

descends
have been the case in the days of Elisbeth, when agriculture and
internal commerce were in their infancy.

(a) De re militari, lib. 1. cap. 3.

* "But sometimes there is a necessity for arming the townspeople, and calling them out to service. When this is the case, it ought to be the first care, to enure them to labour, to march them up and down the country, to make them carry heavy burdens, and to harden them against the weather. Their food

should

descends from the highest to the lowest, infecting all ranks of men; and there is little opportunity in it for such exercise as renders the body vigorous and robust. This is a physical objection against a great city: the next regards morality. Virtue is exerted chiefly in restraint: vice, in giving freedom to desire. Moderation and self-command form a character the most susceptible of virtue: superfluity of animal spirits, and love of pleasure, form a character the most liable to vice. Low vices, pilfering for example, or lying, draw few or no imitators; but vices that indicate a soul above restraint, fail not to produce admirers. Where a man boldly struggles against unlawful restraint, he is justly applauded and imitated; and the vulgar are not apt to distinguish nicely between lawful and unlawful restraint: the boldness is visible, and they pierce no deeper. It is the unruly boy, full of animal spirits, who at public school is admired and imitated; not the virtuous and modest. Vices accordingly that show spirit, are extremely infectious; virtue very little. Hence the corruption of a great city, which increases more and more in proportion to the number of inhabitants. But it is sufficient here barely to mention that objection; because it has been much insisted on in antecedent parts of this work.

The following bad effects are more of a political nature. A great town is a professed enemy to the free circulation of money. The current coin is accumulated in the capital; and distant provinces must sink into idleness; for without ready money neither

"should be coarse and scanty, and they should be habituated to sleep alternately
 "in their tents, and in the open air. Then is the time to instruct them in the ex-
 "ercise of their arms. If the expedition is a distant one, they should be chiefly
 "employ'd in the stations of posts or expresses, and removed as much as possible
 "from the dangerous allurements that abound in large cities; that thus they may
 "be enervated both in mind and body."

arts

arts nor manufactures can flourish. Thus we find less and less activity, in proportion commonly to the distance from the capital, and an absolute torpor in the extremities. It may be observed beside, that as horses in a great city must be provided with provender from a distance, the country is robbed of its dung for the benefit of the rich fields round the city. But as manure laid upon poor land is of more advantage to the farmer than upon what is already highly improved, the depriving distant parts of manure is a loss to the country in general. Nor is this all: The dung of an extensive city, the bulk of it at least, is so remote from the fields to which it must be carried, that the expence of carriage swallows up the profit.

Another bad effect of accumulating money in the capital is, to raise there the price of labour; and the temptation of high wages, making every one flock to the capital, robs the country of its best hands. And as they who resort to the capital are commonly young people, who remove as soon as they are fit for work, distant provinces are burdened with their maintenance, without reaping any benefit by their labour.

But of all, the most deplorable effect of a great city, is the preventing of population, by shortening the lives of its inhabitants. Does a capital swell in proportion to the numbers that are drained from the country? Far from it. The air of a populous city is infected by multitudes crowded together; and people there seldom make out the usual time of life. With respect to London in particular, the fact is but too well ascertained. The burials in that immense city greatly exceed the births: the difference some affirm to be no less than ten thousand yearly: by the most moderate computation, not under seven or eight thousand. As London is far from being on the decline, the consumption of so many inhabitants must be supplied from the country; and the annual supply amounts probably to a greater number than were needed annually for recruiting our armies and navies in the late war with

France. If so, London is a greater enemy to population, than a bloody war would be, supposing it even to be perpetual. What an enormous tax is Britain thus subjected to for supporting her capital ! The rearing and educating yearly for London 7 or 8000 persons, require an immense sum.

In Paris, if the bills of mortality can be relied on, the births and burials are nearly equal, being each of them about 19,000 yearly ; and according to that computation, Paris should need no recruits from the country. But in that city, the bills of mortality cannot be depended on for burials. It is there universally the practice of high and low, to have their infants nursed in the country, till they be three years of age ; and consequently those who die before that age, are not inlisted. What proportion these bear to the whole is uncertain. But a guess may be made from such as die in London ; which are computed to be one half of the whole that die (a). Now giving the utmost allowance for the healthiness of the country above that of a town, Paris children that die in the country before the age of three, cannot be brought so low as a third of those that die. On the other hand, the London bills of mortality are less to be depended on for births than for burials. None are inlisted but infants baptized by clergymen of the English church ; and the numerous children of Papists, Dissenters, and other sectaries, are left out of the account. Upon the whole, the difference between the births and burials in Paris and in London, is much less than it appears to be on comparing the bills of mortality of these two cities.

At the same time, giving full allowance for children that are not brought into the London bills of mortality, there is the highest probability that a greater number of children are born in Paris than in London ; and consequently that the former requires fewer recruits from the country than the latter. In Paris, dome-

(a) See Dr Price, p. 362.

stic servants are encouraged to marry: they are observed to be more settled than when bachelors, and more attentive to their duty. In London, such marriages are discouraged, as rendering a servant more attentive to his own family, than to that of his master. But a servant attentive to his own family, will not, for his own sake, neglect that of his master. At any rate, is he not more to be depended on, than a servant who continues a bachelor? What can be expected of idle and pampered bachelors, but debauchery and every sort of corruption? Nothing restrains them from absolute profligacy, but the eye of the master, who for that reason is their aversion not their love. If the poor-laws be named the folio of corruption, bachelor-servants in London may well be considered as a large appendix. And this attracts the eye to the poor-laws, which indeed make the chief difference between Paris and London, with respect to the present point. In Paris, certain funds are established for the poor, the yearly produce of which admits but a limited number. As that fund is always pre-occupied, the low people who are not on the list, have little or no prospect of bread, but from their own industry; and to the industrious, marriage is in a great measure necessary. In London, a parish is taxed in proportion to the number of its poor; and every person who is pleased to be idle, is entitled to maintenance. Most things thrive by encouragement, and idleness above all. Certainty of maintenance, renders the low people in England idle and profligate; especially in London, where luxury prevails, and infects every rank. So insolent are the London poor, that scarce one of them will condescend to eat brown bread. There are accordingly in London, a much greater number of idle and profligate wretches, than in Paris, or in any other town in proportion to the number of inhabitants. These wretches, in Doctor Swift's style, never think of posterity, because posterity never thinks of them: men who hunt after pleasure, and live from day to day,

have no notion of being burdened with a family. These causes produce a greater number of children in Paris than in London; tho' probably they differ not much in populousness.

I shall add but one other objection to a great city, which is not slight. An overgrown capital, far above a rival, has, by numbers and riches, a distressing influence in public affairs. The populace are ductile, and easily misled by ambitious and designing magistrates. Nor are there wanting critical times, in which such magistrates, acquiring artificial influence, may have power to disturb the public peace. That an overgrown capital may prove dangerous to sovereignty, has more than once been experienced both in Paris and London.

It would give one the spleen, to hear the French and English zealously disputing about the extent of their capitals, as if the prosperity of their country depended on that circumstance. To me it appears like one glorying in the king's-evil, or in any contagious distemper. Much better employ'd would they be, in contriving means for lessening those cities. There is not a political measure, that, in my opinion, would tend more to aggrandize the kingdom of France, or of Britain, than to split its capital into several great towns. My plan would be, to confine the inhabitants of London to 100,000, composed of the King and his household, supreme courts of justice, government-boards, prime nobility and gentry, with necessary shopkeepers, artists, and other dependents. Let the rest of the inhabitants be distributed into nine towns properly situated, some for internal commerce, some for foreign. Such a plan would diffuse life and vigour thro' every corner of the island.

To execute such a plan, would, I acknowledge, require the deepest political skill, and much perseverance. I shall suggest what occurs at present. The first step must be, to mark proper spots for the nine towns, the most advantageous for trade, or for manufactures.

manufactures. If any of these spots be occupied already with small towns, so much the better. The next step is a capitation-tax on the inhabitants of London; the sum levied to be appropriated for encouraging the new towns. One encouragement would have a good effect; which is, a premium to every man who builds in any of these towns, more or less, in proportion to the size of the house. This tax would banish from London, every manufacture but of the most lucrative kind. When, by this means, the inhabitants of London are reduced to a number not much above 100,000, the near prospect of being relieved from the tax, will make every householder active to banish all above that number: and to prevent a renewal of the tax, a greater number will never again be permitted. It would require great penetration to proportion the sums to be levied and distributed, so as to have their proper effect, without overburdening the capital on the one hand, or giving too great encouragement for building on the other, which might tempt people to build for the premium merely, without any further view. Much will depend on an advantageous situation: houses built there will always find inhabitants.

The two great cities of London and Westminster are extremely ill fitted for local union. The latter, the seat of government and of the noblesse, infects the former with luxury and with love of show. The former, the seat of commerce, infects the latter with love of gain. The mixture of these opposite passions, is productive of every groveling vice.

SKETCH

S K E T C H XII.

Origin and Progress of AMERICAN NATIONS.

HAVING no authentic materials for a natural history of all the Americans, the following observations shall be confined to a few tribes, the best known; and to the kingdoms of Peru and Mexico, as they were at the date of the Spanish conquest.

As there appears no passage by land to America from the old world, no problem has more embarrassed the learned, than to give an account from whence the Americans sprung: there are as many different opinions, as there are writers. Many attempts have been made for discovering a passage by land; but hitherto in vain. Kamiskatka, it is true, is divided from America by a narrow strait, full of islands: and M. Buffon, to render the passage still more easy than by sea, conjectures, that thereabout there may formerly have been a land-passage, tho' now wash'd away by violence of the ocean. There is indeed great appearance of truth in this conjecture; as all the quadrupeds of the north of Asia seem to have made their way to America; the bear, for example, the roe, the deer, the rein-deer, the beaver, the wolf, the fox, the hare, the rat, the mole. He admits, that in America there is not to be seen a lion, a tiger, a panther, or any other Asiatic quadruped of a hot climate: not, says he, for want of a land-passage;

sage; but because the cold climate of Tartary, in which such animals cannot subsist, is an effectual bar against them *.

But in my apprehension, much more is required to give satisfaction upon this subject, than a passage from Kamskatka to America, whether by land or sea. An enquiry much more decisive is totally overlooked, relative to the people on the two sides of the streight; particularly, whether they speak the same language. Now by late accounts from Russia we are informed, that there is no affinity between the Kamskatkan tongue, and that of the Americans on the opposite side of the streight. Whence we may conclude, with great certainty, that the latter are not a colony of the former.

But I go farther. There are several cogent arguments to evince, that the Americans are not descended from any people in the north of Asia or in the north of Europe. Were they descended from either, Labrador, or the adjacent countries, must have been first peopled. And as savages are remarkably fond of their natal soil, they would have continued there, till by over-population they should have been compelled to spread wider for food. But the fact is directly contrary. When America was discovered by the Spaniards, Mexico and Peru were fully peopled; and the other parts less and less, in proportion to their distance from these central countries. Fabry reports, that one may travel one or two hundred leagues north-west from the Mississippi, without seeing a human face, or any vestige of a house. And some French offi-

* Our author, with singular candor, admits it as a strong objection to his theory, that there are no rein-deer in Asia. But it is doing no more but justice to so fair a reasoner, to observe, that according to the latest accounts, there are plenty of rein-deer in the country of Kamskatka, which of all is the nearest to America.

cers say, that they travelled more than a hundred leagues from the delicious country watered by the Ohio, through Louisiana, without meeting a single family of savages. Labrador is very thin of inhabitants; no people having been discovered in it, but the Esquimaux, a very small tribe. And as that tribe has plenty of food at home, there is no appearance, that they ever sent a colony to any other part of America. The civilization of the Mexicans and Peruvians, as well as their populousness, make it extremely probable that they were the first inhabitants of America. In travelling northward, the people are more and more ignorant and savage: the Esquimaux, the most northern of all, are the most savage. In travelling southward, the Patagonians, the most southern of all, are so stupid as to go naked in a bitter cold region.

I venture still farther; which is, to conjecture, that America has not been peopled from any part of the old world. The external appearance of the inhabitants, makes this conjecture approach to a certainty; as that appearance differs widely from the appearance of any other known people. Excepting the eye-lashes, eye-brows, and hair of the head, which is invariably jet black, there is not a single hair on the body of any American: not the least appearance of a beard. Another distinguishing mark is their copper-colour, uniformly the same in all climates, hot and cold; and differing from the colour of all other nations. Ulloa remarks, that the Americans of Cape Breton, resemble the Peruvians in complexion, in manners, and in customs; the only visible difference being, that the former are of a larger stature. A third circumstance no less distinguishing is, that American children are born with down upon the skin, which disappears the eighth or ninth day, and never grows again. Children of the old world are born with skins smooth and polished, and no down appears till puberty.

That the original inhabitants of America are a race distinct from

all

all others, I once thought demonstrable from some reports concerning the Esquimaux. The author of the history of New France and several other writers report, that the Esquimaux are bold, mischievous, suspicious, and untamable; that it is not even safe to converse with them but at a distance; that no European skin is whiter; and that they are bearded up to the eyes. Supposing these facts to be true, had I not reason to believe, that the Esquimaux must have sprung from some nation in the north of Europe or Asia, tho' I could not pretend to say, whether the transmigration was by land or sea? From the same facts, however, I was forc'd to conclude, that the rest of the Americans could not have had the same origin; for if the Canadians or any other American nation were of Asiatic or European extraction, they must, like the Esquimaux, have had a beard and white skin to this day. But one cannot be too cautious in giving faith to odd or singular facts, reported of distant nations. It is discovered by later accounts more worthy of credit, that the foregoing description of the Esquimaux is false in every particular. Of all the northern nations, not excepting the Laplanders, the Esquimaux are of the smallest size, few of them exceeding four feet in height. They have heads extremely gross, feet and hands very small. That they are neither cruel nor suspicious, appears from what Ellis says in his account of a voyage *anno* 1747, for discovering a north-west passage, that they offered their wives to the English sailors, with expressions of satisfaction for being able to accommodate them. But what is the most to the present purpose; they are of a copper colour, like the other Americans, only a degree lighter, occasioned probably by the intense cold of their climate; and they are also altogether destitute of a beard. It is common indeed among them, to bring forward the hair of the head upon the face, for preserving it from flies, which rage in that country during summer; an appearance

pearance that probably has been mistaken by travellers for a beard.

It has been lately discovered, that the language of the Esquimaux is the same with that of the Greenlanders. A Danish missionary, who by some years residence in Greenland had acquired the language of that country, made a voyage with Commodore Palliser to Newfoundland ann. 1764. Meeting a company of about two hundred Esquimaux, he was agreeably surpris'd to hear the Greenland tongue. They received him kindly, and drew from him a promise to return the next year. And we are informed by Crantz, in his history of Greenland, that the same Danish missionary visited them the very next year, in company with the Rev. Mr Drachart. They agreed, that the difference between the Esquimaux language and that of Greenland was not greater than between the dialects of North and South Greenland, which differ not so much as the High and Low Dutch. Both nations call themselves *Innuït* or *Karalit*, and call the Europeans *Kablunet*. Their stature, features, manners, dress, tents, darts, and boats, are entirely the same. As the language of Greenland resembles not the language of Finland, Lapland, Norway, Tartary, nor that of the Samoides, it is evident, that neither the Esquimaux nor Greenlanders are a colony from any of the countries mentioned. Geographers begin now to conjecture, that Greenland is a part of the continent of North America, without intervention of any sea *. One thing is certain, that the Greenlanders resemble the North-Americans in every particular: they are of a copper colour, and have no beard; they are of a small size, like the Esquimaux, and have the same

* The Danes had a settlement in Greenland long before Columbus saw the West Indies. Would it not appear paradoxical to say, that America was discovered by the Danes long before the time of Columbus, and long before they knew that they had made the discovery?

language. And thus I am obliged to abandon my favourite argument, for proving the Americans, the Esquimaux excepted, to be indigenous, and not indebted to the old world for their existence. At the same time, the other arguments urged above remain entire; and from what is now said a circumstance occurs, that fortifies greatly the chief of them. People, who with a bold face surmount all difficulties rather than give up a favourite opinion, make light of the copper colour and want of beard, willing to attribute all to the climate. We want *data*, I acknowledge, to determine with accuracy what effects can be produced by a climate. But luckily we have no occasion at present to determine that difficult point. It is sufficient that the climate of Labrador is much the same with that of the northern parts of Europe and Asia. From that circumstance I conclude with certainty, that the copper colour and want of beard in the Esquimaux cannot be the result of climate. And if so, what foundation can there be for making these circumstances depend on the climate in any other part of America? Truly none at all. I add, that as the copper colour and want of beard continue invariably the same in every variety of climate, hot and cold, moist and dry, they must depend on some invariable cause acting uniformly; which may be a singularity in the race of people (*a*), but cannot proceed from the climate.

If we can rely on the conjectures of an eminent writer (*b*), America emerged from the sea later than any other part of the known world: and supposing the human race to have been planted in America by the hand of God later than the days of Moses, Adam and Eve might have been the first parents of mankind, *i. e.* of all who at that time existed, without being the first parents of the Americans.

(*a*) Book 1. sketch 1.

(*b*) M. Buffon.

The *Terra Australis incognita* is separated from the rest of the world by a wide ocean, which carries a ship round the earth without interruption. How has that continent been peopled? There is not the slightest probability, that it ever has been joined to any other land. Here a local creation, if it may be termed so, appears unavoidable; and if we must admit more than one act of creation, even the appearance of difficulty, from reiteration of acts, totally vanisheth. M. Buffon, in his natural history, bears testimony, that not a single American quadruped of a hot climate is found in any other part of the earth: with respect to these we must unavoidably admit a local creation; and nothing seems more natural, than under the same act to comprehend the first parents of the American people.

It is possible, indeed, that a ship with men and women may, by contrary winds, be carried to a very distant shore. But to account thus for the peopling of America, will not be much relished: Mexico and Peru must have been planted before navigation was known in the old world, at least before a ship was brought to such perfection as to bear a long course of bad weather. Will it be thought, that any supposition ought to be embraced, however improbable, rather than admit a separate creation? We are, it is true, much in the dark as to the conduct of creative providence; but every rational conjecture leans to a separate creation. America and the *Terra Australis* must have been planted by the Almighty with a number of animals and vegetables, some of them peculiar to those vast continents: and when such care has been taken about inferior life, can so wild a thought be admitted, as that man, the noblest work of terrestrial creation, would be left to chance? But it is scarce necessary to insist upon this topic, as the external characters of the Americans above mentioned reject the supposition of their being descended from any people of the old world.

It is highly probable, that the fertile and delicious plains of Peru and Mexico were the first planted of all the American countries; being more populous at the time of the Spanish invasion than any other part of that great continent. This conjecture is supported by analogy: we believe that a spot, not central only, but extremely fertile, was chosen for the parents of the old world; and there is not in America a spot more central, or more fertile, than Mexico or Peru, for the parents of the new world.

Having thus ventured to throw out what occurred upon the origin of the Americans, without pretending to affirm any thing as certain, we proceed to their progress. The North-American tribes are remarkable with respect to one branch of their history, that, instead of advancing, like other nations, toward the maturity of society and government, they continue to this hour in their original state of hunting and fishing. A case so singular rouses our curiosity; and we wish to be made acquainted with the cause.

It is not the want of animals capable to be domesticated, that obliges them to remain hunters and fishers. The horse, it is true, the sheep, the goat, were imported from Europe; but there are plenty of American quadrupeds no less docile than those mentioned. There is, in particular, a species of horned cattle peculiar to America, having long wool instead of hair, and an excrescence upon the shoulder like that of the East-India buffalo. These wild cattle multiply exceedingly in the fertile countries which the Mississippi traverses; and Hennepin reports, that the Indians, after killing numbers, take no part away but the tongue, which is reckoned a delicious morsel. These creatures are not extremely wild; and, if taken young, are easily tamed: a calf, when its dam is killed, will follow the hunter, and lick his hand. The wool, the hide, the tallow, would be of great value in the British colonies.

If the shepherd-state be not obstructed in America by want of

proper

proper cattle, the only account that can or need be given is, paucity of inhabitants. Consider only the influence of custom, in rivetting men to their local situation and manner of life: once hunters, they will always be hunters, till some cause more potent than custom force them out of that state. Want of food, occasioned by rapid population, brought on the shepherd-state in the old world. That cause has not hitherto taken place in North America: the inhabitants, few in number, remain hunters and fishers, because that state affords them a competency of food. I am aware, that the natives have been decreasing in number from the time of the first European settlements. But even at that time the country was ill peopled: take for example the country above described, stretching north-west from the Mississippi: the Europeans never had any footing there, and yet to this day it is little better than a desert. I give other examples. The Indians who surround the lake Nipissing, from whence the river St Laurence issues, are in whole but five or six thousand; and yet their country is of great extent: they live by hunting and fishing, having bows and arrows, but no fire-arms; and their cloathing is the skins of beasts: they are seldom, if ever, engaged in war; have no commerce with any other people, Indian or European, but live as if they had a world to themselves (a). If that country be ill peopled, it is not from scarcity of food; for the country is extensive, and well stored with every sort of game. On the south and west of the lake Superior, the country is level and fruitful all the way to the Mississippi, having large plains covered with rank grass, and scarce a tree for hundreds of miles: the inhabitants enjoy the greatest plenty of fish, fowl, deer, &c.; and yet their numbers are far from being in proportion to their means of subsistence. In short, it is the conjecture of the ablest writers, that in the vast extent of North

(a) Account of North America by Major Robert Rogers.

America, when discovered, there were not as many people, laying aside Mexico, as in the half of Europe. *Comparison to this*
Paucity of inhabitants explains clearly why the North-American tribes remain hunters and fishers, without advancing to the shepherd-state. But if the foregoing difficulty be removed, another starts up, no less puzzling, viz. By what adverse fate are so rich countries so ill peopled? It is a conjecture of M. Buffon, mentioned above, that America has been planted later than the other parts of this globe. But supposing the fact, it has however not been planted so late as to prevent a great population, witness Mexico and Peru, fully peopled at the era of the Spanish invasion. We must therefore search for another cause; and none occurs but the infecundity of the North-American savages. M. Buffon, a respectable author, and for that reason often quoted, remarks, that these savages are feeble in their organs of generation, that they have no ardor for the female sex, and that they have few children; to enforce which remark he adds, that the quadrupeds of America, both native and transplanted, are of a diminutive size, compared with those of the old world. A woman never admits her husband, till the child she is nursing be three years old; and this led Frenchmen to go often astray from their Canadian wives. The case was reported by the priests to their superiors in France; but what order was taken has escaped my memory. Among the males, it is an inviolable law, to abstain from females while they are engaged in a military expedition. This is pregnant evidence of their frigidity; for among savages the authority of law, or of opinion, seldom prevails over any strong appetite: vain would be the attempt to restrain them from spirituous liquors, tho' much more debilitating. Neither is there any instance, of violence offered by any North-American savage, to European women taken captives in war.

Mexico and Peru, when conquered by the Spaniards, afforded

to

to their numerous inhabitants the necessaries of life in profusion. Cotton was in plenty, more than sufficient for the cloathing needed in warm climates: Indian wheat was universal, and was cultivated without much labour. The natural wants of the inhabitants were thus supplied with very little trouble; and artificial wants had made no progress. But the present state of these countries is very different. The Indians have learned from their conquerors a multitude of artificial wants, good houses, variety of food, and rich cloaths, which must be imported, because not manufactured at home. They are prohibited from exercising any art or calling except agriculture, which scarce affords them necessaries; and this obliges a great proportion of them to live single. Even agriculture itself is cramped; for in most of the provinces there is a prohibition to plant vines or olives. In short, it is believed that the inhabitants who existed at the Spanish invasion are reduced to a fourth part. The savages also of North America who border on the European settlements are visibly diminishing. When the English settled in America, the five nations could raise 15,000 fighting men: at present they are not able to raise 2000. Upon the whole, it is computed by able writers, that the present inhabitants of America amount not to a twentieth part of those who existed when that continent was discovered by Columbus. This decay is ascribed to the intemperate use of spirits, and to the small-pox, both of them introduced by the Europeans*.

It

* In all the West-Indian colonies, the slaves continually decrease so as to need frequent recruits from Africa. "This decrease," says the author of a late account of Guiana, "is commonly attributed to oppression and hard labour; tho' with little reason, as the slaves are much more robust, healthy, and vigorous, than their masters. The true cause is, the commerce of white men with young negro wenches, who, to support that commerce, use every mean to avoid conception, and even to procure abortion. By such practices they are incapacitated to bear chil-
"dren

It is observable, that every sort of plague becomes more virulent when transplanted, than in its native place. The plague commits less ravage in Egypt, its native place, than in any other country. The venereal disease was for many ages more violent and destructive in Europe, than ever it was in America, where it was first known. The people who sailed with Christopher Columbus, brought it to Spain from Hispaniola. Columbus, with thirty or forty of his sailors, went directly to Barcelona, where the King then was, to render an account of his voyage. All the inhabitants, who at that time tripled the present number, were immediately seized with the venereal disease, which raged so furiously as to threaten destruction to all. The small pox comes under the same observation; for it has swept away many more in America, than ever it did in Europe. In the 1713, the crew of a Dutch vessel infected the Hottentots with the small pox; which left scarce a third of the inhabitants. And the same fate befel the Laplanders and Greenlanders. In all appearance, that disease, if it abate not soon of its transplanted virulence, will extirpate the natives of North America; for they know little of inoculation.

But spiritous liquors are a still more effectual cause of depopulation. The American savages, male and female, are inordinately fond of spiritous liquors; and savages generally abandon themselves to appetite, without the least control from shame. The noxious effects of intemperance in spirits, are too well known, from

“dren when they settle in marriage with their own countrymen. That this is the true cause, will be evident, from considering, that in Virginia and Maryland, the stock of slaves is kept up without any importation; because in these countries commerce with Negro women is detested, as infamous and unnatural.” The cause here assigned may have some effect: but there is a stronger cause of depopulation, viz. the culture of sugar, laborious in the field, and unhealthy in the house by boiling, &c. The Negroes employ’d in the culture of cotton, coffee, and ginger, seldom need to be recruited.

fatal experience among ourselves : before the use of gin was prohibited, the populace of London were debilitated by it to a degree of losing, in a great measure, the power of procreation. Happily for the human species, the invention of savages never reached the production of gin ; for spirits in that early period would have left not one person alive, not a single Noah to restore the race of men : in order to accomplish the plan of Providence, creation must have been renewed oftener than once *.

In the temperate climates of the old world, there is great uniformity in the gradual progress of men from the savage state to the highest civilization ; beginning with hunting and fishing, advancing to flocks and herds, and thereafter to agriculture and commerce. One would be much disappointed if he expected the same progress in America. Among the northern tribes, there is nothing that resembles the shepherd-state : they continue hunters and fishers as originally ; because there is no cause so potent as to force them from that state to become shepherds. So far clear. But there is another fact of which we have no example in the old world, that seems not so easily explained : these people, without passing through the shepherd-state, have advanced to some degree of agriculture. Before the seventeenth century, the Iroquois, or five nations, had villages, and cultivated Indian corn : the Cherokees have many small towns ; they raise corn in abundance, and fence in their fields : they breed poultry, and have orchards of peach-trees : the Chickesaws and Creek Indians live pretty much in the same manner. The Apalachites sow and reap in common ;

* Charlevoix says, that an Indian of Canada will give all he is worth for a glass of brandy. And he paints thus the effect of drunkenness upon them, " Even in the streets of Montreal are seen the most shocking spectacles of ebriety ; husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters, seizing one another by the throat, and tearing one another with their teeth, like so many enraged wolves."

and

and put up the corn in granaries, to be distributed among individuals when they want food. The Hurons raise great quantities of corn, not only for their own use, but for commerce. Many of these nations, particularly the Cherokees, have of late got horses, swine, and tame cattle; an improvement borrowed from the Europeans. But corn is of an earlier date: when Sir Richard Greenville took possession of Virginia in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the natives had corn; and Hennepin assures us, that the nations bordering on the Mississippi had corn long before they were visited by any European. Husbandry, it is true, is among those people still in its infancy; being left to the women, who sow, who reap, who store up in public granaries, and who distribute as need requires. The inhabitants of Guiana in South America, continue to this day hunters and fishers. But tho' they have neither flocks nor herds, they have some husbandry; for the women plant cassava, yams, and plantains. They make a liquor, like our ale, termed *pinwree*, which they drink with their food. And tho' they are extremely fond of that liquor, their indolence makes them often neglect to provide against want. To a people having a violent propensity to intemperance, as all savages have, this improvidence is a blessing; for otherwise they would wallow in perpetual drunkenness. They are by no means singular; for unconcern about futurity is the characteristic of all savages. To forego an immediate for a distant enjoyment, can only be suggested by cultivated reason. When the Canary islands were first visited by the Europeans, which was in the fourteenth century, the inhabitants had corn, for which the ground was prepared in the following manner. They had a wooden instrument, not unlike a hoe, with a spur or tooth at the end, on which was fixed a goat's horn. With this instrument the ground was stirred; and if rain came not in its proper season, water was brought by canals from the rivulets. It was the women's province to reap the corn: they took only the ears; which

they threshed with sticks, or beat with their feet, and then winnowed in their hands. Husbandry probably will remain in its present state among American savages; for as they are decreasing daily, they can have no difficulty about food. The fact however is singular, of a people using corn before tame cattle: there must be a cause, which, on better acquaintance with that people, will probably be discovered.

America is full of political wonders. At the time of the Spanish invasion, the Mexicans and Peruvians had made great advances toward the perfection of society, while the northern tribes, separated from them by distance only, remained in the original state of hunters and fishers, and remain so at this day. To explain the difference, appears difficult. It is still more difficult to explain, why the Mexicans and Peruvians, inhabitants of the torrid zone, were highly polished in the arts of society and government; considering that in the old world, the inhabitants of the torrid zone are for the most part little better than savages. We are not sufficiently acquainted with the natural history of America, nor with that of its people, to attempt an explanation of these wonders: it is however part of our task, to state the progress of society among the Mexicans and Peruvians; which cannot fail to amuse the reader, as he will find these two nations differing essentially from the North-American tribes, in every article of manners, government, and police.

When the Spaniards invaded America, the Mexicans were skilful in agriculture. Maize was their chief grain, which, by careful culture, produced great plenty, even in the mountainous country of Tlascalla. They had gardening and botany, as well as agriculture: a physic-garden belonging to the Emperor was open to every one for gathering medicinal plants.

The art of cookery was far advanced among that people. Montezuma's table was generally covered with 200 dishes, many of them exquisitely

exquisitely dressed in the opinion even of the Spaniards. They used salt, which was made by the sun.

The women were dextrous at spinning; and manufactures of cotton and hair abounded every where.

The populousness of Mexico and Peru afford irrefragable evidence, that the arts of peace were there carried to a great height. The city of Mexico contained 60,000 families *; and Montezuma had thirty vassals who could bring into the field, each of them, 100,000 fighting men. Tlascalla, a neighbouring republic, governed by a senate, was so populous as to be almost a match for the Emperor of Mexico.

The public edifices in the city of Mexico, and houses of the nobility, were of stone, and well built. The royal palace had thirty gates opening to as many streets. The principal front was of jasper, black, red, and white, well polished. Three squares, built and adorned like the front, led to Montezuma's apartment, having large rooms, floors covered with mats of different kinds, walls hung with a mixture of cotton-cloth and rabbit-furs; the innermost room adorned with hangings of feathers, beautified with various figures in lively colours. In that building, large ceilings were formed so artificially without nails, as to make the planks sustain each other. Water was brought into the city of Mexico, from a mountain at a league's distance.

Gold and silver were in so high esteem, that vessels made of these metals were permitted to none but to the Emperor. Considering the value put upon gold and silver, the want of current coin would argue great dulness in that nation, if instances did

* We cannot altogether rely on what is reported of this ancient empire with respect to numbers. The city of Mexico, tho' considerably enlarged since the Spanish conquest, doth not at present contain more than 60,000 souls, including 20,000 Negroes and Mulattoes.

not daily occur of improvements, after being carried to a considerable height, stopping short at the very threshold of perfection. The want of current coin made fairs the more necessary, which were carried on with the most perfect regularity: judges on the spot decided mercantile differences; and inferior officers, making constant circuits, preserved peace and order. The abundance and variety of the commodities brought to market, and the order preserved by such multitudes, amazed the Spaniards; a spectacle deserving admiration, as a testimony of the grandeur and good government of that extensive empire.

The fine arts were not unknown in Mexico. Their goldsmiths were excellent workmen, particularly in moulding gold and silver into the form of animals. Their painters made landscapes and other imitations of nature with feathers, so artfully mixed as to bestow both life and colouring; of which sort of work, there were instances no less extraordinary for patience than for skill. Their drinking-cups were of the finest earth exquisitely made, differing from each other in colour, and even in smell. Of the same materials, they made great variety of vessels both for use and ornament.

They were not ignorant either of music or of poetry; and one of their capital amusements was songs set to music upon the achievements of their kings and ancestors.

With such a progress both in the useful and fine arts, is it not surprising, that tho' they had measures, they knew nothing of weights?

As to the art of writing, a capital article in the conduct of government, they were extremely deficient. That art, as mentioned above, was no farther advanced than the using figures composed of painted feathers, by which they made a shift to communicate some simple thoughts; and in that manner was Montezuma informed of the Spanish invasion.

There

There was great ingenuity shewn in regulating the calendar: the Mexican year was divided into 365 days; and into 18 months, containing 20 days each, which made 360; the remaining five intercalary days were added at the end of the year, for making it correspond to the course of the sun. They religiously employ'd these five days upon diversions, being of opinion that they were appropriated to that end by their ancestors.

Murder, theft, and corruption in officers of state, were capital crimes. Adultery also was capital; for female chastity was in high estimation. At the same time, consent was deemed a sufficient cause of divorce, the law leaving it to the parties concerned, who ought to be the best judges. In case of a divorce, the father took care of the male children, leaving the female children with the mother. But to prevent rash separations, it was capital for them to unite again.

It may be gathered from what has been said, that there was a distinction of rank among the Mexicans. So religiously was it observed, as to be display'd even in their buildings: the city of Mexico was divided into two parts, one appropriated to the Emperor and nobility, and one left to plebeians.

Education of children was an important article in the Mexican police. Public schools were allotted for plebeian children; and colleges well endowed for the sons of the nobility, where they continued till they were fit for business. The masters were considered as officers of state; not without reason, as their office was to qualify young men for serving their king and country. Such of the young nobles as made choice of a military life, were sent to the army, and made to suffer great hardships before they could be enlisted. They had indeed a powerful motive for perseverance, the most honourable of all employments being that of a soldier. Young women of quality were educated with no less care, by proper matrons chosen with the utmost circumspection.

As

As hereditary nobility, especially in an extensive empire, leads to monarchy, the government of Mexico was monarchical; and as the progress of monarchy is from being elective to be hereditary, Mexico had advanced no farther than to be an elective monarchy, of which Montezuma was the eleventh king. It would in time have become hereditary, had it not been subdued by the Spaniards. And it was an example of an elective monarchy that approaches the nearest to hereditary; for the power of election, as well as the privilege of being elected, were confined to the princes of the blood-royal. As a talent for war was chiefly regarded in chusing a successor to the throne, the Mexican kings always commanded their own armies. The Emperor-elect, before his coronation, was obliged to make some conquest, or perform some warlike exploit; a custom that supported the military spirit, and enlarged the kingdom. From every king was exacted a coronation-oath, to adhere to the religion of his ancestors, to maintain the laws and customs of the empire, and to be a father to his people.

The various affairs of government were distributed among different boards with great propriety. The management of the royal patrimony was allotted to one board; appeals from inferior tribunals, to another; the levying of troops, and the providing of magazines, to a third: matters of supreme importance were referred to a council of state, held generally in the King's presence. These boards, all of them, were composed of men experienced in the arts of war and of peace: the council of state was composed of those who elected the Emperor.

Concerning the patrimony of the crown, mines of gold and silver belonged to the Emperor; and the duty on salt brought in a great revenue. But the capital duty was, a third of the land-rents, the estates of the nobles excepted; upon whom no tribute was imposed, but to serve in the army with a number of their vassals,
and

and to guard the Emperor's person. Goods manufactured and sold were subjected to a duty; which was not prejudicial to their manufactures, because there was no rival nation within reach.

Montezuma introduced a multitude of ceremonies into his court, tending to inspire veneration for his person; an excellent politic in rude times, of however little significancy among nations enlightened and rational. Veneration and humility were so much the tone of the court, that it was even thought indecent in the Mexican lords, to appear before the King in their richest habits. Vessels of gold and silver were appropriated to his table, and not permitted even to the princes of the blood. The table-cloths and napkins, made of the finest cotton, with the earthen ware, never made a second appearance at the Emperor's table, but were distributed among the servants.

In war, their offensive weapons were bows and arrows; and as iron was not known in America, their arrows were headed with bones sharpened at the point. They used also darts, and long wooden swords, in which were fixed sharp flints; and men of more than ordinary strength fought with clubs. They beside had slingers, who threw stones with great force and dexterity. Their defensive arms, used only by commanders and persons of distinction, were a coat of quilted cotton, a sort of breast-plate, and a shield of wood or tortoise-shell, adorned with plates of such metal as they could procure. The private men fought naked; their faces and bodies being deformed with paint, in order to terrify the enemy. They had warlike instruments of music, such as sea-shells, flutes made of large canes, and a sort of drum made of the trunk of a tree hollow'd. Their battalions consisted of great numbers crouded together, without even the appearance of order. They attacked with fury, and terrible outcries, in order to intimidate the enemy; a practice prompted by nature, and formerly used by many nations. It was not despised even by the Romans;

for Cato the elder was wont to say, that he had obtained more victories by the throats of his soldiers, than by their swords; and Cæsar applauds his own soldiers, above those of Pompey, for their warlike shouts. Eagerness to engage is vented in loud cries: and the effects are excellent: they redouble the ardor of those who attack, at the same time that they strike terror into the enemy.

Their armies were formed with ease: the princes of the empire, with the cacics or governors of provinces, were obliged to repair to the general rendezvous, each with his quota of men.

Their fortifications were trunks of large trees, fixed in the ground like pallisades, leaving no intervals but what were barely sufficient for discharging their arrows upon the enemy.

Military orders were instituted, with peculiar habits, as marks of distinction and honour; and each cavalier bore the device of his order, painted upon his robe, or fixed to it. Montezuma founded a new order of knighthood, into which princes only were admitted, or nobles descended from the royal stock; and as a token of its superiority, he became one of its members. The knights of that order had part of their hair bound with a red ribbon, to which a tassel was fixed hanging down to the shoulder. Every new exploit was honoured with an additional tassel; which made the knights with ardor embrace every opportunity to signalize themselves. As nothing can be better contrived than such a regulation for supporting a military spirit, the Mexicans would have been invincible had they understood the order of battle: for want of which that potent empire fell a prey to a handful of strangers. I differ from those who ascribe that event to the fire-arms of the Spaniards, and to their horses. These could not be more terrible to the Mexicans, than elephants were at first to the Romans: but familiarity with these unwieldy animals, restored to the Romans their wonted courage; and the Mexicans probably would have

have behaved like the Romans, had they equalled the Romans in the art of war.

When that illustrious people, by their own genius, without borrowing from others, had made such proficiency in the arts of peace, as well as of war; is it not strange, that with respect to religion they were no better than savages? They not only practised human sacrifices, but dressed and eat the flesh of those that were sacrificed. Their great temple was contrived to raise horror; upon the walls were multiplied the figures of noxious serpents; the heads of persons sacrificed were stuck up in different places, and carefully renewed when wasted by time. There were eight temples in the city, nearly of the same architecture; 2000 of a smaller size, dedicated to different idols; scarce a street without a tutelary deity; nor a calamity that had not an altar, to which the distressed might have recourse for a remedy. Unparalleled ignorance and stupidity, obliged every Emperor, at his coronation, to swear, that there should be no unseasonable rains, no overflowing of rivers, no fields affected with sterility, nor any man hurt with the bad influences of the sun. In short, it was a slavish religion, built upon fear, not love. At the same time, they believed the immortality of the soul, and rewards and punishments in a future state; which made them bury with their dead, quantities of gold and silver, for defraying the expence of their journey; and also made them put to death some of their servants to attend them. Women sometimes, actuated with the same belief, were authors of their own death, in order to accompany their husbands.

The author that we must chiefly rely on for an account of Peru is Garcilasso de la Vega: tho' he may be justly suspected of partiality; for being of the Inca race, he bestows on the Peruvian government, improvements of later times. The articles that appear the least suspicious are what follow.

The principle of the Peruvian constitution seems to have been

an Agrarian law, of the strictest kind. To the sovereign was first allotted a large proportion of land, for defraying the expences of government; and the remainder was divided among his subjects, in proportion to the number of each family. These portions were not alienable: the sovereign was held proprietor of the whole, as in the feudal system; and from time to time the distribution was varied according to the circumstances of families. This Agrarian law contributed undoubtedly to the populousness of the kingdom of Peru.

It is a sure sign of improved agriculture, that aqueducts were made by the Peruvians for watering their land. Their plough was of wood, a yard long, flat before, round behind, and pointed at the end for piercing the ground. Agriculture seems to have been carried on by united labour: lands appropriated for maintaining the poor were first ploughed; next the portion allotted to soldiers performing duty in the field: then every man separately ploughed his own field; after which he assisted his neighbour: they proceeded to the portion of the curaca or lord: and lastly to the King's portion. In the month of March they reaped their maize, and celebrated the harvest with joy and feasting.

There being no artist nor manufacturer by profession, individuals were taught to do every thing for themselves. Every one knew how to plough and manure the land: every one was a carpenter, a mason, a shoemaker, a weaver, &c.; and the women were the most ingenious and diligent of all. Blas Valera mentions a law, named *the law of brotherhood*, which, without the prospect of reward, obliged them to be mutually aiding and assisting in ploughing, sowing, and reaping, in building their houses, and in every sort of occupation.

As the art was unknown of melting down metals by means of bellows, long copper pipes were contrived, contracted at the further

ther end, that the breath might act the more forcibly on the fire; and they used ten or twelve of these pipes together, when they wanted a very hot fire. Having no iron, their hatchets and pick-axes were of copper, and they had neither saw nor augre, nor any instrument of iron: ignorant of the use of nails, they tied their timber with cords of hemp. The tool they had for cutting stone, was a sharp flint; and with that tool they shaped the stone by continual rubbing, more than by cutting. Having no engines for raising stones, they did all by strength of arm. These defects notwithstanding, they erected great edifices; witness the fortress of Cusco, a stupenduous fabric. It passes all understanding, by what means the stones, or rather the great rocks, employ'd in that building, were brought from the quarry. One of these stones, measured by Acofta, was thirty feet in length, eighteen in breadth, and six in thickness.

Having neither scissars nor needles of metal, they used a certain long thorn for a needle. The mirrors used by ladies of quality were of burnished copper: but such implements of dress were reckoned too effeminate for the men.

With respect to music, they had an instrument of hollow canes glew'd together, the notes of which were like those of an organ. They had love-songs accompanied with a pipe; and war-songs, which were their festival entertainment. They composed and acted comedies and tragedies. The art of writing properly so called, was unknown: but silken threads, with knots cast upon them of divers colours, enabled them to keep exact accounts, and to sum them up with a readiness that would have rivalled an expert European arithmetician. They had also attained to as much geometry as to measure their fields.

In war, their offensive arms were the bow and arrow, lance, dart, club, and bill. Their defensive arms, were the helmet and target.

target. The army was provided from the King's stores, and was no burden upon the people.

In philosophy, they had made no progress. An eclipse of the moon was attributed to her being sick; and they fancied the milky way to be a ewe giving suck to a lamb. With regard to the setting sun, they said, that he was a good swimmer, and that he pierced through the waves, to rise next morning in the east. But such ignorance is not wonderful; for no branch of science can make a progress without writing.

The people were divided into small bodies of ten families each; every division had a head, and a register was kept of the whole; a branch of public police, that very much resembles the English decennaries.

They made but two meals, one between eight and nine in the morning, the other before sunset. Idleness was punished with infamy: even children were employ'd according to their capacity, public visitors or monitors were appointed, having access to every house, for inspecting the manners of the inhabitants; who were rewarded or punished according to their behaviour. Moderation and industry were so effectually enforc'd by this article of police, that few were reduced to indigence; and these got their food and cloathing out of the King's stores.

With respect to their laws and customs, children were bound to serve their parents until the age of twenty-five; and marriage contracted before that time, without consent of parents, was null. Polygamy was prohibited, and persons were confined to marry within their own tribe. The tradition, that the Inca family were children of the sun, introduced incest among them; for it was a matter of religion to preserve their divine blood pure and unmixed.

It was the chief article of the Peruvian creed, upon which every other article of their religion depended, that the Inca family

were

were children of their great god the sun, and sent by him to spread his worship and his laws among them. Nothing could have a greater influence upon an ignorant and credulous people, than such a doctrine. The sanctity of the Inca family was so deeply rooted in the hearts of the Peruvians, that no person of that family was thought capable of committing a crime. Such blind veneration for a family, makes it probable, that the government of Peru under the Incas had not subsisted many years; for a government founded upon deceit and superstition, cannot long continue its authority. However that be, such belief of the origin of the Incas, is evidence of great virtue and moderation in that family; for any gross act of tyranny or injustice, would have opened the eyes of the people to see their error. Moderation in the sovereign, and in the subjects obedience without reserve, cannot fail to produce a government mild and gentle; which was verified in that of Peru, so mild and gentle, that to manure and cultivate the lands of the Inca, and to lay up the produce in store-houses, were the only burdens imposed upon the people, if it was not sometimes to make cloaths and weapons for the army. At the same time their kings were so revered, that these articles of labour were performed with great alacrity.

The government was equally gentle with regard to punishments. Indeed very few crimes were committed, being considered as a sort of rebellion against their great god the sun. The only crime that seems to have been punished with severity, is the marauding of soldiers; for death was inflicted, however inconsiderable the damage.

In this empire, there appears to have been the most perfect union between law and religion; which could not fail to produce obedience, order, and tranquillity, among that people, though extremely numerous. The Inca family was fam'd for moderation: they made conquests in order to civilize their neighbours; and as they

they seldom if ever transgressed the bounds of morality, no other art was necessary to preserve the government entire, but to keep the people ignorant of true religion. They had virgins dedicated to the sun, who, like the vestal virgins in Rome, were under a vow of perpetual chastity.

This subject shall be concluded with some slight observations on the two governments I have been describing. Comparing them together, the Mexican government seems to have been supported by arms; that of Peru by religion.

The kings of Peru were hereditary and absolute: those of Mexico elective. In contradiction however to political principles, the government of Peru was by far the milder. It is mentioned above, that the electors of the Mexican kings were hereditary princes; and the same electors composed the great council of state. Montesquieu therefore has been misinformed when he terms this a despotic monarchy (a): a monarchy can never be despotic, where the sovereign is limited by a great council, the members of which are independent of him. As little reason has he to term Peru despotic. An absolute monarchy it was, but the farthest in the world from being despotic: on the contrary, we find not in history any government so well contrived for the good of the people. An Agrarian law, firmly rooted, prevented that great inequality of rank and riches which lead to luxury, and dissolution of manners: a commonwealth was naturally the result of such a constitution; and probably would have taken place, had it not been for a government no less suitable, and still more mild, viz. a theocracy under a family sent from heaven to make them happy. This wild opinion, supported by ignorance and superstition, proved an effectual bar against tyranny in the monarch; a most exemplary conduct on his part being necessary for supporting the o-

(a) L'Esprit des loix, liv. 17. ch. 2.

pinion of his divinity. Upon the whole, comprehending king and subject, there perhaps never existed more virtue in any other government, whether monarchical or republican.

In Peru there are traces of some distinction of ranks, arising probably from office merely, which, as in France, were a bulwark to the monarch against the peasants. The great superiority of the Peruvian Incas, as demi-gods, did not admit a hereditary nobility.

With respect to the progress of arts and manufactures, the two nations differed widely: in Mexico, arts and manufactures were carried to a surprising height, considering the tools they had to work with: in Peru, they had made no progress, every man, as among mere savages, providing the necessaries of life for himself. As the world goes at present, such numbers are employ'd upon our multiplied wants, that not above one of a hundred can be spared for war. In ancient times, when these wants were few, and not much enlarged beyond nature, it is computed that an eighth part could be spared for war: and hence the numerous armies we read of in the history of ancient nations. The Peruvians had it in their power to go still farther: it was possible to arm the whole males capable of service: leaving the women to supply the few necessities that might be wanted during a short campaign; and accordingly we find that the Incas were great conquerors.

The religion of the Peruvians, considered in a political light, was excellent. The veneration they paid their sovereign upon a false religious principle, was their only superstition; and that superstition contributed greatly to improve their morals and their manners: on the other hand, the religion of Mexico was abominable.

Upon the whole, there never was a country destitute of iron, where arts seem to have been carried higher than in Mexico; and,

bating their religion, there never was a country destitute of writing, where government seems to have been more perfect. I except not the government of Peru, which, not being founded on political principles, but on superstition, might be more mild, but was far from being so solidly founded.

SKETCHES

Modesty, industry, and the art of reasoning, are three great branches of a learned education; and are justly held to be the basis of life. They are indeed not essential to those learned men of the world: the most profound philosopher makes but an ineffectual figure in a fashionable company; would be somewhat ridiculous in a court-ball, and an absolute absurdity among the company of wits, or jokers at a dinner-table.

Having their religion, there never was a country destitute of writing, where government seems to have been more perfect. I except not the government of Peru, which was not being founded on political principles, but on superstition, might be more said, but was far from being so solidly founded.

S K E T C H E S O F T H E H I S T O R Y O F M A N.

B O O K III.

Progress of S C I E N C E S.

P R E F A C E.

*M*orality, theology, and the art of reasoning, are three great branches of a learned education; and are justly held to be so, because they are our only sure guides in passing through the intricate paths of life. They are indeed not essential to those termed men of the world: the most profound philosopher makes but an insipid figure in fashionable company; would be somewhat ridiculous at a court-ball; and an absolute absurdity among the gamesters at Arthur's, or jockeys at

Newmarket. But, these cogent objections notwithstanding, I venture to pronounce such studies to be not altogether unsuitable to a gentleman. Man is a creature full of curiosity; and to gratify that appetite, many roam through the world, submitting to heat and cold, nay to hunger and thirst, without a sigh. Could indeed that troublesome guest be expelled, we might hug ourselves in ignorance; and, like true men of the world, undervalue knowledge, that can neither procure money, nor a new sensual pleasure. But, alas! the expulsion is not in the power of every one; and those who have not that power, will probably think it not amiss, to employ their curiosity upon studies that make them good members of society, and endear them to every person of virtue.

And were we even men of the world in such perfection, as to regard nothing but our own interest; yet does not ignorance lay us open to the crafty and designing? and does not the art of reasoning guard many an honest man from being misled by subtle sophisms? With respect to right and wrong, not even passion is more dangerous than error. And as to religion, better it were to settle in a conviction that there is no God, than to be in a state of wavering and fluctuation; sometimes indulging every loose desire, as if we were not accountable beings; and sometimes yielding to superstitious fears, as if there were no god but the devil. To a well-disposed mind, the existence of a supreme benevolent Deity, appears highly probable: and if happily the study of theology lead us to a conviction that there really is such a being; the conviction will be a source of constant enjoyment, which I boldly set above the titillating pleasures of external sense. Possibly there may be less present amusement in abstract studies, than in news-papers, in party-pamphlets, or in Hoyl upon Whist: but let us for a moment anticipate futurity, and imagine that we are reviewing past transactions, — how pleasant the retrospect of those who have maintained the dignity of their nature, and employ'd their talents to the best purposes!

Contradictory opinions that have influence on practice, will be regretted by every person of a sound heart; and as erroneous opinions are commonly

monly the result of imperfect education, I would gladly hope, that a remedy is not altogether out of reach. At the revival of arts and sciences, the learned languages were our sole study, because in them were locked up all the treasures of useful knowledge. This study has long ago ceased to be the chief object of education; and yet the original plan is handed down to us with very little variation. Wishing to contribute to a more perfect system of education, I present to the public the following sketches. The books that have been published upon morality, theology, and the art of reasoning, are not eminent either for simplicity, or for clear ideas. To introduce these into the subjects mentioned, is my aim; with what success, is cheerfully submitted to the judgement of others. The historical part, hitherto much neglected, is necessary as a branch of my general plan; and I am hopeful, that beside instruction, it will contribute to recreation, which, in abstract studies, is no less necessary than pleasant.

SKETCH

S K E T C H I.

Principles and Progress of REASON.

S E C T I O N I.

PRINCIPLES OF REASON.

EVery affirmation, whatever be the subject, is termed a *proposition*.

Truth and error are qualities of propositions. A proposition that says a thing is what it is in reality, is termed a *true proposition*. A proposition that says a thing is what it is not in reality, is termed an *erroneous proposition*.

Our knowledge of what is agreeable and disagreeable in objects is derived from the sense of beauty, handled in Elements of Criticism. Our knowledge of right and wrong in actions, is derived from the moral sense, to be handled in the sketch immediately following. Our knowledge of truth and error is derived from various sources.

Our external senses are one source of knowledge: they lay open to us external subjects, their quantities, their actions, with events produced by these actions. The internal senses are another source of knowledge: they lay open to us things passing in the mind; thinking,

thinking, for example, deliberating, inclining, resolving, willing, consenting, and other actions; and they also lay open to us our emotions and passions. There is a sense by which we perceive the truth of many propositions; such as, That every thing which begins to exist, must have a cause; That every effect adapted to some end or purpose, proceeds from a designing cause; and, That every effect adapted to a good end or purpose, proceeds from a designing and benevolent cause. A multitude of axioms in every science, particularly in mathematics, are perceived to be equally true. By a peculiar sense, of which afterward, we know that there is a Deity. By another sense we know, that the external signs of passion are the same in all men; that animals of the same external appearance, are of the same species; and that animals of the same species, have the same properties (a). By another sense we see into futurity: we know that the sun will rise to-morrow; that the earth will perform its wonted course round the sun; that winter and summer will follow each other in succession; that a stone dropt from the hand will fall to the ground; and a thousand other such propositions.

There are many propositions, the truth of which is not so apparent: a process of reasoning is necessary, of which afterward.

Human testimony is another source of knowledge. So framed are we by nature, as to rely on human testimony; by which we are informed of beings, attributes, and events, that never came under any of our senses.

The knowledge that is derived from the sources mentioned, is of different kinds. In some cases, our knowledge includes absolute certainty, and produces the highest degree of conviction: in other cases, probability comes in place of certainty, and the conviction is inferior in degree. Knowledge of the latter kind is distinguished

into

(a) Book 1, sketch 1.

into belief, which concerns facts; and opinion, which concerns relations, and other things that fall not under the denomination of facts. In contradistinction to opinion and belief, that sort of knowledge which includes absolute certainty, and produces the highest degree of conviction, retains its proper name. To explain what is here said, I enter into particulars.

The sense of seeing, with very few exceptions, affords knowledge in its proper sense. It is not in our power to doubt of the existence of a person we see, touch, and converse with; and when such is our constitution, it is a vain attempt to call in question the authority of our sense of seeing, as some writers pretend to do. No one ever called in question the existence of internal actions and passions, laid open to us by internal sense; and there is as little ground for doubting of what we see. The sense of seeing, it is true, is not always correct: through different mediums the same object is seen differently: to a jaundic'd eye every thing appears yellow; and to one intoxicated with liquor, two candles sometimes appear four. But we are never left without remedy in such a case: it is the province of the reasoning faculty, to correct every error of that kind.

An object of sight, when recalled to mind by the power of memory, is termed an *idea* or secondary perception. An original perception, as said above, affords knowledge in its proper sense; but a secondary perception affords belief only. And Nature in this, as in all other instances, is faithful to truth; for it is evident, that we cannot be so certain of the existence of an object in its absence, as when present.

With respect to many abstract propositions, of which instances are above given, we have an absolute certainty and conviction of their truth, derived to us from various senses. We can, for example, entertain as little doubt, that every thing which begins to exist, must have a cause, as that the sun is in the firmament; and

as

as little doubt that he will rise to-morrow, as that he is now set. There are many other propositions, the truth of which is probable only, not absolutely certain; as, for example, that things will continue in their ordinary state. That natural operations are performed in the simplest manner, is an axiom of natural philosophy: it may be probable, but is far from being certain*.

In every one of the instances given, conviction arises from a single act of perception; for which reason, knowledge acquired by means of that perception, not only knowledge in its proper sense, but also opinion and belief, are termed *intuitive knowledge*. But there are many things, the knowledge of which is not obtained with so much facility. Propositions for the most part require a process or operation in the mind, termed *reasoning*; leading, by certain intermediate steps, to the proposition that is to be demonstrated or made evident; which, in opposition to intuitive knowledge, is termed *discursive knowledge*. This process or operation must be explained, in order to understand the nature of reasoning. And as reasoning is mostly employ'd in discovering relations, I shall draw my examples from them. Every proposition concerning relations, is an affirmation of a certain relation between two subjects. If the relation affirmed appear not intuitively, we must search for a third subject, that appears intuitively to be connected with each of the others, by the relation affirmed: and if such a subject be found, the proposition is demonstrated; for it is

* I have given this proposition a place, because it is assumed as an axiom by all writers on natural philosophy. And yet there appears some room for doubting, whether the conviction we have of it do not proceed from a bias in our nature, rather than from an original sense. Our taste for simplicity, which undoubtedly is natural, renders simple operations more agreeable than what are complex, and consequently makes them appear more natural. It deserves a most serious discussion, whether the operations of nature be always carried on with the greatest simplicity, or whether we be not misled by our taste for simplicity, to be of that opinion.

intuitively certain, that two subjects, connected with a third by any particular relation, must be connected together by the same relation. The longest chain of reasoning may be linked together in this manner. Running over such a chain, every one of the subjects must appear intuitively to be connected with that immediately preceding, and with that immediately subsequent, by the relation affirmed in the proposition; and from the whole united, the proposition, as above mentioned, must appear intuitively certain. The last step of the process is termed a *conclusion*, being the last or concluding perception.

No sort of reasoning affords so clear a notion of the foregoing process, as that which is mathematical. Equality is the only mathematical relation; and comparison therefore is the only means by which mathematical propositions are ascertained. To that science belong a set of intuitive propositions, termed *axioms*, which are all founded on equality. For example: Divide two equal lines, each of them, into a thousand equal parts, a single part of the one line must be equal to a single part of the other. Second: Take ten of these parts from the one line, and as many from the other, and the remaining parts must be equal: which is more shortly expressed thus: From two equal lines take equal parts, and the remainders will be equal; or add equal parts, and the sums will be equal. Third: If two things be, in the same respect, equal to a third, the one is equal to the other in the same respect. I proceed to show the use of these axioms. Two things may be equal without being intuitively so; which is the case of the equality between the three angles of a triangle and two right angles. To demonstrate that truth, it is necessary to search for some other angles, which appear by intuition to be equal to both. If this property cannot be discovered in any one set of angles, we must go more leisurely to work, by trying to find angles that are equal to the three angles of a triangle. These being discovered, we next try to find other angles equal to the
angles

angles now discovered ; and so on in the comparison, till at last we discover a set of angles, equal not only to those thus introduced, but also to two right angles. We thus connect the two parts of the original proposition, by a number of intermediate equalities ; and by that means perceive, that these two parts are equal among themselves ; it being an intuitive proposition, as mentioned above, That two things are equal, each of which, in the same respect, is equal to a third.

I proceed to a different example, which concerns the relation between cause and effect. The proposition to be demonstrated is, " That there exists a good and intelligent Being, who is the cause of all the wise and benevolent effects that are produced in the government of this world." That there are such effects, is in the present example the fundamental proposition, which is taken for granted, because it is verified by experience. In order to discover the cause of these effects, I begin with an intuitive proposition mentioned above, " That every effect adapted to a good end or purpose, proceeds from a designing and benevolent cause." The next step is, to examine whether man can be the cause : he is provided indeed with some share of wisdom and benevolence ; but the effects mentioned are far above his power, and no less above his wisdom. Neither can this earth be the cause, nor the sun, the moon, the stars ; for, far from being wise and benevolent, they are not even sensible. If these be excluded, we are unavoidably led to an invisible being, endowed with boundless power, goodness, and intelligence ; and that invisible being is termed *God*.

Reasoning requires two mental powers, namely, the powers of invention, and of perceiving relations. By the former are discovered intermediate propositions, equally related to the fundamental proposition, and to the conclusion ; and by the latter we perceive, that the different links which compose the chain of reasoning, are all connected together by the same relation.

We can reason about matters of opinion and belief, as well as about matters of knowledge, properly so termed. Hence reasoning is distinguished into two kinds; demonstrative, and probable. Demonstrative reasoning is also of two kinds: in the first, the conclusion is drawn from the nature and inherent properties of the subject: in the other, the conclusion is drawn from some principle, of which we are certain by intuition. With respect to the first, we have no such knowledge of the nature or inherent properties of any being, material or immaterial, as to draw conclusions from it with certainty. I except not even figure considered as a quality of matter, tho' it is the object of mathematical reasoning. As we have no standard for determining with precision the figure of any portion of matter, we cannot with precision reason upon it: what appears to us a straight line may be a curve, and what appears a rectilinear angle may be curvilinear. How then comes mathematical reasoning to be demonstrative? This question may appear at first sight puzzling; and I know not that it has any where been distinctly explained. Perhaps what follows may be satisfactory.

The subjects of arithmetical reasoning are numbers. The subjects of mathematical reasoning are figures. But what figures are subjects of mathematical reasoning? Not such as I see; but such as I form an idea of, abstracting from every imperfection. I explain myself. There is a power in man to form images of things that never existed; a golden mountain, for example, or a river running upward. This power operates upon figures. There is perhaps no figure existing the sides of which are straight lines. But it is easy to form an idea of a line, that has no waving or crookedness in it; and it is easy to form an idea of a figure bounded by such lines. Such ideal figures are the subjects of mathematical reasoning; and these being perfectly clear and distinct, are proper subjects for demonstrative reasoning of the first kind. Mathematical

thematical reasoning however is not merely a mental entertainment: it is of real use in life, by directing the powers and properties of matter. There possibly may not be found any where a perfect globe, to answer the idea we form of that figure: but a globe may be made so near perfection, as that the properties demonstrated to belong to the idea of a perfect globe will be nearly applicable to that figure. In a word, tho' ideas are, properly speaking, the subject of mathematical evidence; yet the end and purpose of that evidence is, to direct us with respect to figures as they really exist; and the nearer any real figure approaches to the idea we form of it, with the greater accuracy will the mathematical truth be applicable.

The component parts of figures, viz. lines and angles, are extremely simple, requiring no definition. Place before a child a crooked line, and one that has no appearance of being crooked; call the former a *crooked line*, the latter a *straight line*; and the child will use these terms familiarly, without hazard of a mistake. Draw a perpendicular upon paper; let the child advert, that the upward line leans neither to the right nor the left, and for that reason is termed a *perpendicular*: the child will apply that term familiarly to a tree, to the wall of a house, or to any other perpendicular. In the same manner, place before the child two lines diverging from each other, and two that have no appearance of diverging: call the latter *parallel lines*, and the child will have no difficulty of applying the same term to the sides of a door or of a window. Yet so accustomed are we to definitions, that even these simple ideas are not suffered to escape. A straight line, for example, is defined to be the shortest that can be drawn between two given points. The fact is certain; but so far from a definition, that it is an inference drawn from the idea of a straight line: and had I not beforehand a clear idea of a straight line, I could not infer that it is the shortest between two given points.

D'Alembert

D'Alembert strains hard, but without success, for a definition of a straight line, and of the others mentioned. It is difficult to avoid smiling at his definition of parallel lines. Draw, says he, a straight line: erect upon it two perpendiculars of the same length: upon their two extremities draw another straight line; and that line is said to be parallel to the first mentioned: as if, to understand what is meant by the expression *two parallel lines*, we must first understand what is meant by a straight line, by a perpendicular, and by two lines equal in length. A very slight reflection upon the operations of his own mind, would have taught this author, that he could form the idea of parallel lines without running through so many intermediate steps: sight alone is sufficient to explain the term to a boy, and even to a girl. At any rate, where is the necessity of introducing the line last mentioned? If the idea of parallels cannot be obtained from the two perpendiculars alone, the additional line drawn through their extremities will certainly not make it more clear.

Mathematical figures being in their nature complex, are capable of being defined; and from the foregoing simple ideas, it is easy to define every one of them. For example, a circle is a figure having a point within it, named the *centre*, through which all the straight lines that can be drawn, and extended to the circumference, are equal; a surface bounded by four equal straight lines, and having four right angles, is termed a *square*; and a cube is a solid, of which all the six surfaces are squares.

In the investigation of mathematical truths, we assist the imagination, by drawing figures upon paper that resemble our ideas. There is no necessity for a perfect resemblance: a black spot, which in reality is a small round surface, serves to represent a mathematical point; and a black line, which in reality is a long narrow surface, serves to represent a mathematical line. When we reason about the figures composed of such lines, it is sufficient that

that these figures have some appearance of regularity: less or more is of no importance; because our reasoning is not founded upon them, but upon our ideas. Thus, to demonstrate that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, a triangle is drawn upon paper, in order to keep the mind steady to its object, and to prevent wandering. After tracing the steps that lead to the conclusion, we are satisfied that the proposition is true; being conscious that the reasoning is built upon the ideal figure, not upon that which is drawn upon the paper. And being also conscious that the enquiry is carried on independent of any particular length of the sides, we are satisfied of the universality of the proposition, and of its being applicable to all triangles whatever.

Numbers considered by themselves, abstractedly from things, make the subject of arithmetic. And with respect both to mathematical and arithmetical reasonings, which frequently consist of many steps, the process is shortened by the invention of signs, which, by a single dash of the pen, express clearly what would require many words. By that means, a very long chain of reasoning is expressed by a few symbols; a method that contributes greatly to readiness of comprehension. If in such reasonings words were necessary, the mind, embarrassed with their multiplicity, would have great difficulty to follow any long chain of reasoning. A line drawn upon paper represents an ideal line, and a few simple characters represent the abstract ideas of number.

Arithmetical reasoning, like mathematical, depends entirely upon the relation of equality, which can be ascertained with the greatest certainty among many ideas. Hence, reasonings upon such ideas afford the highest degree of conviction. I do not say, however, that this is always the case; for a man who is conscious of his own fallibility, is seldom without some degree of diffidence,

where

where the reasoning consists of many steps. And tho' on a review no error is discovered, yet he is conscious that there may be errors, tho' they have escaped him. As to the other kind of demonstrative reasoning, founded on some proposition of which we are intuitively certain; I justly call it *demonstrative*, because it affords the same conviction that arises from mathematical reasoning. In both, the means of conviction are the same, viz. a clear perception of the relation between two ideas: and there are many relations of which we have ideas no less clear than of equality; witness substance and quality, the whole and its parts, cause and effect, and many others. From the intuitive proposition, for example, That nothing which begins to exist can exist without a cause, I can conclude, that some one being must have existed from all eternity, with no less certainty, than that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles.

What falls next in order, is that inferior kind of knowledge which is termed *opinion*; and which, like knowledge properly so termed, is founded in some instances upon intuition, and in some upon reasoning. But it differs from knowledge in the following particular, that it produces different degrees of conviction, sometimes approaching to certainty, and sometimes sinking toward the verge of improbability. The constancy and uniformity of natural operations, is a fit subject for illustrating that difference. The future successive changes of day and night, of winter and summer, and of other successions which have hitherto been regular and uniform, fall under intuitive knowledge, because of these we have the highest conviction. As the conviction is inferior of successions that hitherto have been varied in any degree, these fall under intuitive opinion. We expect summer after winter with the utmost confidence; but we have not the same confidence in expecting a hot summer or a cold winter. And yet the probability

lity approaches much nearer to certainty, than the intuitive opinion we have, that the operations of nature are extremely simple; a proposition that is very little rely'd on.

As to opinion founded on reasoning, it is obvious, that the conviction produced by the reasoning, can never rise above what is produced by the intuitive proposition upon which the reasoning is founded. And that it may be weaker, will appear from considering, that even where the fundamental proposition is certain, it may lead to the conclusive opinion by intermediate propositions, that are probable only, not certain. In a word, it holds in general with respect to every sort of reasoning, that the conclusive proposition can never rise higher in point of conviction, than the very lowest of the intuitive propositions employ'd as steps in the reasoning.

The perception we have of the contingency of future events, opens a wide field to our reasoning about probabilities. That perception involves more or less doubt according to its subject. In some instances, the event is perceived to be extremely doubtful; in others it is perceived to be less doubtful. It appears altogether doubtful, in throwing a dye, which of the six sides will turn up; and for that reason, we cannot justly conclude for one rather than another. If one only of the six sides be marked with a figure, we conclude, that a blank will turn up; and five to one is an equal wager that such will be the effect. In judging of the future behaviour of a man who has hitherto been governed by interest, we may conclude with a probability approaching to certainty, that interest will continue to prevail.

Belief comes last in order, which, as defined above, is knowledge of the truth of facts that falls below certainty, and involves in its nature some degree of doubt. It is also of two kinds; one founded upon intuition, and one upon reasoning. Thus, knowledge, opinion, belief, are all of them equally distinguishable in-

to intuitive and discursive. Of intuitive belief, I discover three different sources or causes. First, A present object. Secondly, An object formerly present. Thirdly, The testimony of others.

To have a clear conception of the first cause, it must be observed, that among the simple perceptions that compose the complex perception of a present object, a perception of real and present existence is one. This perception rises commonly to certainty, in which case it is a branch of knowledge properly so termed; and is handled as such above. But this perception falls below certainty in some instances; as when an object, seen at a great distance, or in a fog, is perceived to be a horse, but so indistinctly as to make it a probability only. The perception in such a case is termed *belief*. Both perceptions are fundamentally of the same nature; being simple perceptions of real existence. They differ only in point of accuracy: the perception of reality that makes a branch of knowledge, is so clear and distinct as to exclude all doubt or hesitation: the perception of reality that occasions belief, being less clear and distinct, makes not the existence of the object certain to us, but only probable.

With respect to the second cause; the existence of an absent object, formerly seen, amounts not to a certainty; and therefore is the subject of belief only, not of knowledge. Things are in a continual flux from production to dissolution; and our senses are accommodated to that variable scene: a present object admits no doubt of its existence; but after it is removed, its existence becomes less certain, and in time sinks down to a slight degree of probability.

Human testimony, the third cause, produces belief, more or less strong, according to circumstances. In general, nature leads us to rely upon the veracity of each other; and commonly the degree of reliance is proportioned to the degree of veracity. Sometimes belief approaches to certainty, as when it is founded on the evidence

evidence of persons above all exception. Sometimes it sinks to the lowest degree of probability, as when a fact is told by one who has no great reputation for truth. The nature of the fact, common or uncommon, has likewise an influence: an ordinary incident gains credit upon very slight evidence; but it requires the strongest evidence to overcome the improbability of an event that deviates from the ordinary course of nature. At the same time, it must be observed, that belief is not always founded upon rational principles. There are biases and weaknesses in human nature that sometimes disturb the operation, and produce belief without sufficient or proper evidence: we are disposed to believe on very slight evidence, an interesting event, however rare or singular, that alarms and agitates the mind; because the mind, in agitation, is remarkably susceptible of impressions: for which reason, stories of ghosts and apparitions pass current with the vulgar. Eloquence also has great power over the mind; and, by making deep impressions, enforces the belief of facts upon evidence that would not be regarded in a cool moment.

The dependence that our perception of real existence, and consequently belief, hath upon oral evidence, enlivens social intercourse, and promotes society. But the perception of real existence has a still more extensive influence; for from that perception is derived a great part of the entertainment we find in history, and in historical fables (a). At the same time, a perception that may be raised by fiction as well as by truth, would often mislead, were we abandoned to its impulse: but the God of nature hath provided a remedy for that evil, by erecting within the mind a tribunal, to which there lies an appeal from the rash impressions of sense. When the delusion of eloquence or of dread

(a) Elements of Criticism, ch. 2. part 1. § 7.

subsides, the perplexed mind is uncertain what to believe. A regular process commences, counsel is heard, evidence produced, and a final judgement pronounced, sometimes confirming, sometimes varying, the belief impressed upon us by the lively perception of reality. Thus, by a wise appointment of nature, intuitive belief is subjected to rational discussion: when confirmed by reason, it turns more vigorous and authoritative: when contradicted by reason, it disappears among sensible people. In some instances, it is too headstrong for reason; as in the case of hobgoblins and apparitions, which pass current among the vulgar in spite of reason.

We proceed to the other kind of belief, viz. that which is founded on reasoning, to which, when intuition fails us, we must have recourse for ascertaining certain facts. Thus, from known effects, we infer the existence of unknown causes. That an effect must have a cause, is an intuitive proposition; but to ascertain what particular thing is the cause, requires commonly a process of reasoning. This is one of the means by which the Deity, the primary cause, is made known to us, as mentioned above. Reason, in tracing causes from known effects, produces different degrees of conviction. It sometimes produces certainty, as in proving the existence of the Deity; which on that account is handled above, under the head of knowledge. For the most part it produces belief only, which, according to the strength of the reasoning, sometimes approaches to certainty, and sometimes is so weak as barely to turn the scale on the side of probability. Take the following examples of different degrees of belief founded on probable reasoning. When Inigo Jones flourished, and was the only architect of note in England, let it be supposed that his model of the palace of Whitehall had been presented to a stranger, without mentioning the author. The stranger, in the first place, would have been intuitively certain, that this was the work of
some

some being intelligent and skilful. Secondly, He would have had a conviction approaching to certainty, that the operator was a man. And, thirdly, He would have had a conviction that the man was Inigo Jones; but less firm than the former. Let us next suppose another English architect little inferior in reputation to Jones: the stranger would still have pronounced in favour of the latter; but his belief would have been in the lowest degree.

When we investigate the causes of certain effects, the reasoning is often founded upon the known nature of man. In the high country, for example, between Edinburgh and Glasgow, the people lay their coals at the end of their houses, without any fence to secure them from theft: whence it is rationally inferred, that coals are there in plenty. In the west of Scotland, the corn-stacks are covered with great care and nicety: whence it is inferred, that the climate is rainy. Placentia is the capital town of Biscay; and the only town in Newfoundland bears the same name; from which circumstance it is conjectured, that the Biscayners were the first Europeans who made a settlement in that island.

Analogical reasoning, founded upon the uniformity of nature, is frequently employ'd in the investigation of facts; and we infer, that facts of which we are uncertain, must resemble those of the same kind that are known. The bulk of the reasonings in natural philosophy are of that kind. Take the following examples. We learn from experience, that proceeding from the humblest vegetable to man, there are numberless classes of beings, rising one above another, by differences scarce perceptible, and leaving nowhere a single gap or interval: and from conviction of the uniformity of nature, we infer, that the line is not broken off here, but is carried on in other worlds, till it end in the Deity. I proceed to another example. Every man is conscious of a self-motive power in himself; and from the uniformity of nature, we infer

infer the same power in every one of our own species. The argument here from analogy carries great weight, because we entertain no doubt of the uniformity of nature with respect to beings of our own kind. We apply the same argument to other animals, tho' their resemblance to man appears not so certain, as that of one man to another. But why not also apply the same argument to infer a self-motive power in matter? When we see matter in motion without an external mover, we naturally infer, that, like us, it moves itself. Another example is borrow'd from Maupertuis. "As there is no known space of the earth covered with water so large as the *Terra Australis incognita*, we may reasonably infer, that so great a part of the earth is not altogether sea, but that there must be some proportion of land." The uniformity of nature with respect to the intermixture of sea and land, is an argument that affords but a very slender degree of conviction. The following argument of the same kind, tho' it cannot be much rely'd on, seems however better founded. "The inhabitants of the northern hemisphere, have, in arts and sciences, excelled such of the southern as we have any knowledge of: and therefore, if inhabitants be found in the *Terra Australis incognita*, we ought not to expect among them many arts, nor much cultivation."

After a fatiguing investigation of numberless particulars which divide and scatter the thought, it may not be unpleasant to bring all under one view by a succinct recapitulation.

We have two means for discovering truth, and acquiring knowledge, viz. intuition and reasoning. By intuition we discover subjects, and their attributes, passions, internal action, and in short every thing that is matter of fact. By intuition we also discover several relations. There are some facts, and many relations, that cannot be discovered by a single act of intuition, but

but require several such acts linked together in a chain of reasoning.

Knowledge acquired by intuition, includes for the most part certainty: in some instances it includes probability only. Knowledge acquired by reasoning, frequently includes certainty; but more frequently includes probability only.

Probable knowledge, whether founded on intuition or on reasoning, is termed *opinion* when it concerns relations; and is termed *belief* when it concerns facts. When knowledge includes certainty, it retains its proper name.

Reasoning that produces certainty, is termed *demonstrative*; and is termed *probable*, when it only produces probability.

Demonstrative reasoning is of two kinds. The first is, where the conclusion is derived from the nature and inherent properties of the subject: mathematical reasoning is of that kind; and perhaps the only instance. The second is, where the conclusion is derived from some proposition, of which we are certain by intuition.

Probable reasoning is endless in its varieties; and affords different degrees of conviction, depending on the nature of the subject upon which it is employ'd.

S E C T. II.

P R O G R E S S O F R E A S O N.

A Progress from infancy to maturity in the mind of man, similar to that in his body, has been often mentioned. The external senses, being early necessary for self-preservation, arrive quickly at maturity. The internal senses are of a slower growth, as well as every other mental power: their maturity would be of little or no use while the body is weak, and unfit for action. Reasoning, as observed in the first section, requires two mental powers, viz. the power of invention, and that of perceiving relations. By the former power are discovered intermediate propositions, equally related to the fundamental proposition and to the conclusion; and that relation is verified by the latter power. Both powers are necessary to the person who frames an argument, or a chain of reasoning: the latter only to the person who judges of it. Savages are miserably deficient in both. With respect to the former, a savage may have a pregnant talent for invention; but it will stand him in little stead without a stock of ideas enabling him to select what may answer the purpose; and what opportunity has a savage to acquire such a stock? With respect to the latter, he knows little of relations: and how should he know, when both study and practice are necessary for distinguishing between relations, and for preventing the being imposed on by the shadow of a relation instead of the substance? The understanding, at the same time, among the illiterate, is obsequious to passion and prepossession;

possession; and among them the imagination acts without control, forming conclusions often no better than mere dreams. In short, considering the many causes that mislead from just reasoning, in days especially of ignorance, the erroneous and absurd opinions that have prevailed in the world, and that continue in some measure to prevail, are far from being surprising. Were reason our only guide in the conduct of life, we should have cause to complain; but our Maker has provided us with the moral sense, a guide little subject to error in matters of importance. In the sciences, reason is essential; but in the conduct of life, which is our chief concern, reason may be an useful assistant; but to be our director is not its province.

The national progress of reason has been slower in Europe, than that of any other art. Statuary, painting, architecture, and other fine arts, approach nearer perfection, as well as morality and natural history. Manners, it is true, and every art that appears externally, may in part be acquired by imitation and example: in reasoning there is nothing external to be laid hold of. But there is beside a particular cause that regards Europe, which is the blind deference that for many ages was paid to Aristotle; who has kept the reasoning faculty in chains more than two thousand years. In his logics, the plain and simple mode of reasoning is rejected, that which Nature dictates; and in its stead is introduced an artificial mode, showy but unsubstantial: it is of no use in discovering truth, but nobly contrived for wrangling and disputation. Considering that reason for so many ages has been locked up in the enchanted castle of syllogism, where empty phantoms pass for realities, the slow progress of reason toward maturity is far from being surprising. The taking of Constantinople, ann. 1453, opened a new scene, which in time relieved the world from the usurpation of Aristotle, and restored reason to her privileges. All the knowledge of Europe was centred in Con-

stantinople; and the learned men of that city, abhorring the Turks and their government, took refuge in Italy. The Greek language was introduced among the western nations of Europe; and the study of Greek and Roman classics became fashionable. Men, having acquired new ideas, began to think for themselves: they exerted their native faculty of reason: the futility of Aristotle's logics became apparent to the penetrating; and is now apparent to all. Yet so late as the year 1621, several persons were banished from Paris for contradicting that philosopher, about matter and form, and about the number of the elements. And shortly after, the parliament of Paris prohibited, under pain of death, any thing to be taught contrary to the doctrines of Aristotle. Julius II. and Leo X. Roman Pontiffs, contributed zealously to the reformation of letters; but they did not foresee that they were also contributing to the reformation of religion, and of every science that depends on reasoning. Tho' the fetters of syllogism have many years ago been shaken off, yet, like a limb long kept from motion, the reasoning faculty has scarcely to this day attained its free and natural exercise. Mathematics is the only science that never has been cramped by syllogism, and we find reasoning there in great perfection at an early period. The very slow progress of reasoning in other matters, will appear from the following induction.

To exemplify erroneous and absurd reasonings of every sort, would be endless. The reader, I presume, will be satisfied with a few instances; and I shall endeavour to select what are amusing. For the sake of order, I divide them into three heads. First, Instances showing the imbecility of human reason during its non-age. Second, Erroneous reasoning occasioned by natural biases. Third, Erroneous reasoning occasioned by acquired biases. With respect to the first, instances are endless of reasonings founded on erroneous premisses. It was an Epicurean doctrine, That the gods

have

have all of them a human figure; moved by the following argument, that no being of any other figure has the use of reason. Plato, taking for granted the following erroneous proposition, That every being which moves itself, must have a soul, concludes that the world must have a soul, because it moves itself (a). Aristotle taking it for granted, without the least evidence, and contrary to truth, that all heavy bodies tend to the centre of the universe, proves the earth to be the centre of the universe by the following argument. "Heavy bodies naturally tend to the centre of the universe: we know by experience that heavy bodies tend to the centre of the earth: therefore the centre of the earth is the centre of the universe." Appion ridicules the Jews for adhering so literally to the precept of resting on their sabbath, as to suffer Jerusalem to be taken that day by Ptolomy son of Lagus. Mark the answer of Josephus: "Whoever passes a sober judgement on this matter, will find our practice agreeable to honour and virtue; for what can be more honourable and virtuous, than to postpone our country, and even life itself, to the service of God, and of his holy religion?" A strange idea of religion, to put it in direct opposition to every moral principle! A superstitious and absurd doctrine, That God will interpose by a miracle, to declare what is right in every matter of controversy, has occasioned much erroneous reasoning and absurd practice. The practice of determining controversies by single combat, commenced about the seventh century, when religion had degenerated into superstition, and courage was esteemed the only moral virtue. The parliament of Paris, in the reign of Charles VI. appointed a single combat between two gentlemen, in order to have the judgement of God, whether the one had committed a rape on

(a) Cicero, De natura Deorum, lib. 2. § 12.

the other's wife. In the 1454, John Picard being accused by his son-in-law for too great familiarity with his wife, a duel between them was appointed by the same parliament. Voltaire justly observes, that the parliament decreed a parricide to be committed, in order to try an accusation of incest, which possibly was not committed. The trials by water and by fire, rest on the same erroneous foundation. In the former, if the person accused sunk to the bottom, it was a judgement pronounced by God, that he was innocent: if he kept above, it was a judgement that he was guilty. Fleury (*a*) remarks, that if ever the person accused was found guilty, it was his own fault. In Sicily, a woman accused of adultery, was compelled to swear to her innocence: the oath, taken down in writing, was laid on water; and if it did not sink, the woman was innocent. We find the same practice in Japan, and in Malabar. One of the articles insisted on by the reformers in Scotland, was, That public prayers be made and the sacraments administered in the vulgar tongue. The answer of a provincial council was in the following words: "That to conceive public prayers, or administer the sacraments, in any language but Latin, is contrary to the traditions and practice of the Catholic church for many ages past; and that the demand cannot be granted, without impiety to God, and disobedience to the church." Here it is taken for granted, that the practice of the church is always right; which is building an argument on a very rotten foundation. The Caribbeans abstain from swines flesh; taking it erroneously for granted, that such food would make them have small eyes, held by them a great deformity. They also abstain from eating turtle; which they think would infect them with the laziness and stupidity of that animal. Upon the same ex-

(a) *Histoire Ecclesiastique.*

roneous notion, the Brasilians abstain from the flesh of ducks, and of every creature that moves slowly.

A talent for writing seems in Germany to be estimated by weight, as beauty is said to be in Holland. Cocceius, for writing three weighty folio volumes on law, has obtained among his countrymen the epithet of *Great*. This author, handling the rules of succession in land-estates, has with most profound erudition founded all of them upon a very simple proposition, viz. That in a competition, that descendent is entitled to be preferred who has the greatest quantity of the predecessor's blood in his veins. *Queritur*, has a man any of his predecessor's blood in his veins, otherwise than metaphorically? Strange! to build an argument in law upon a pure metaphor.

Next of reasonings where the conclusion follows not from the premisses, or fundamental proposition. Plato endeavours to prove, that the world is endowed with wisdom, by the following argument. "The world is greater than any of its parts: therefore it is endowed with wisdom; for otherwise a man who is endowed with wisdom would be greater than the world (a)." The conclusion here does not follow; for tho' man is endowed with wisdom, it follows not, that he is greater than the world in point of size. Zeno endeavours to prove, that the world has the use of reason, by an argument of the same kind. Pope Gregory, writing in favour of the four councils, viz. Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Calcedon, reasons thus: "That as there are four evangelists, there ought also to be four councils." What would he have said, if he had lived 100 years later, when there were many more than four? In administering the sacrament of the Lord's supper, it was ordered, that the host should be covered with a clean linen cloth; because, says the Canon law, the body

(a) Cicero, De natura Deorum, lib. 2. § 17.

of our Lord Jesus Christ was buried in a clean linen cloth. Josephus, in his answer to Appion, urges the following argument for the temple of Jerusalem: "As there is but one God, and one world, it holds in analogy, that there should be but one temple." At that rate, there should be but one worshipper. And why should that one temple be at Jerusalem rather than at Rome or at Pekin? The Syrians and Greeks did not for a long time eat fish. Two reasons are assigned: one is, That fish is not sacrificed to the gods; the other, That being immersed in the sea, they look not up to heaven (a). The first would afford a more plausible argument for eating fish. And if the other have any weight, it would be an argument for sacrificing men, and neither fish nor cattle. In justification of the Salic law, which prohibits female succession, it was long held a conclusive argument, That in the scripture the lilies are said neither to work nor to spin. Vieira, termed by his countrymen *the Lusitanian Cicero*, published sermons, one of which begins thus, "Were the Supreme Being to show himself visibly, he would chuse the circle rather than the triangle, the square, the pentagon, the duodecagon, or any other figure." But why appear in any of these figures? And if he were obliged to appear in so mean a shape, a globe is undoubtedly more beautiful than a circle. Peter Hantz of Horn, who lived in the last century, imagined that Noah's ark is the true construction of a ship; "which," said he, "is the workmanship of God, and therefore perfect;" as if a vessel made merely for floating on the water, were the best also for sailing. Sixty or seventy years ago, the fashion prevailed, in imitation of birds, to swallow small stones for the sake of digestion; as if what is proper for birds, were equally proper for men. The Spaniards, who laid waste a great part of the West Indies, endeavoured to excuse their cruel-

(a) Sir John Marsham, p. 221.

ties, by maintaining, that the natives were not men, but a species of the Ouran Outang; for no better reason, than that they were of a copper colour, spoke an unknown language, and had no beard. The Pope issued a bull, declaring, that it pleased him and the Holy Ghost to acknowledge the Americans to be of the human race. This bull was not received cordially. In the council of Lima, ann. 1583, it was violently disputed, whether the Americans had so much understanding as to be admitted to the sacraments of the church. In the 1440, the Portuguese solicited the Pope's permission to double the Cape of Good Hope, and to reduce to perpetual servitude the negroes, because they had the colour of the damned, and never went to church. In the Frederician Code, a proposition is laid down, That by the law of nature no man can make a testament. And in support of that proposition the following argument is urged, which is said to be a demonstration: "No deed can be a testament while a man is alive, because it is not necessarily his *ultima voluntas*; and no man can make a testament after his death." Both premisses are true, but the negative conclusion does not follow. It is true a man's deed is not his *ultima voluntas*, while he is alive: but does it not become his *ultima voluntas*, when he dies without altering the deed?

Many reasonings have passed current in the world as good coin, where premisses and conclusion are both of them false. Aristotle, who wrote a book upon mechanics, was much puzzled about the equilibrium of a balance, when unequal weights are hung upon it, at different distances from the centre. Having observed, that the arms of the balance describe portions of a circle, he accounted for the equilibrium by a notable argument: "All the properties of the circle are wonderful: the equilibrium of the two weights that describe portions of a circle is wonderful. Ergo, the equilibrium must be one of the properties of the circle." What are we to think of Aristotle's logics, when we find

find him capable of such childish reasoning? And yet that work has been the admiration of all the world for centuries upon centuries. Nay, that foolish argument has been espoused and commented upon by his disciples, for the same length of time. To proceed to another instance: Marriage within the fourth degree of consanguinity, as well as of affinity, is prohibited by the Lateran council; and the reason given is, That the body being made up of the four elements, has four different humours in it*. The Roman Catholics began with beheading heretics, hanging them, or stoning them to death. But such punishments were discovered to be too slight, in matters of faith. It was demonstrated, that heretics ought to be burnt in a slow fire: it was taken for granted, that God punishes them in the other world with a slow fire; and hence it was inferred, "That as every prince and every magistrate is the image of God in this world, they ought to follow his example." Here is a double error in reasoning: first, the taking for granted the fundamental proposition, which is surely not self-evident; and next, the drawing a conclusion from it without any connection.

It once was a general opinion among those who dwelt near the sea, that people never die but during the ebb of the tide. And there were not wanting plausible reasons. The sea, in flowing, carries with it vivifying particles that recruit the sick. The sea is salt, and salt preserves from rotteness. When the sea sinks in

* The original is curious: "Quaternarius enim numerus bene congruit prohibitioni conjugii corporalis; de quo dicit Apostolus, Quod vir non habet potestatem sui corporis, sed mulier; neque mulier habet potestatem sui corporis, sed vir; quia quatuor sunt humores in corpore, quod constat ex quatuor elementis." Were men who could be guilty of such nonsense, qualified to be our leaders in the most important of all concerns, that of eternal salvation?

ebbing,

ebbing, every thing sinks with it: nature languishes: the sick are not vivified: they die.

What shall be said of a reasoning where the conclusion is a flat contradiction to the premises? If a man shooting at a wild pigeon happen unfortunately to kill his neighbour, it is in the English law excusable homicide; because the shooting an animal that is not man's property is a lawful act. If the aim be at a tame fowl for amusement, which is a trespass on the property of another, the death of the man will be manslaughter. If the tame fowl be shot at in order to be stolen, it will be murder, by reason of the felonious intent. From this last the following consequence is drawn, that if a man, endeavouring to kill another, misses his blow, and happeneth to kill himself, he is in judgement of law guilty of wilful and deliberate self-murder (a). Strange reasoning! to construe an act to be wilful and deliberate self-murder, contrary to the very thing that is supposed.

A plentiful source of inconclusive reasoning, which prevails greatly during the infancy of the rational faculty, is the making of no proper distinction between strong and weak relations. Minutius Felix, in his apology for the Christians, endeavours to prove the unity of the Deity from a most distant analogy or relation, viz. That there is but one king of the bees, and that more than one chief magistrate would breed confusion. It is a prostitution of reason to offer such an argument for the unity of the Deity. But any argument passes current, in support of a proposition that we know beforehand to be true. Plutarch says, "that it seemed to have happened by the peculiar direction of the gods, that Numa was born on the 21st of April, the very day in which Rome was founded by Romulus;" a very childish inference from a mere accident. Supposing Italy to have been tol-

(a) Hale, Pleas of the Crown, cap. 1. 413.

rably populous, as undoubtedly it was at that period, the 21st of April, or any day of April, might have given birth to thousands. In many countries, the surgeons and barbers are classed together, as members of the same trade, from a very slight relation, that both of them operate upon the human body. The Jews enjoy'd the reputation for centuries, of being skilful physicians. Francis I. of France, having long laboured under a disease that eluded the art of his own physicians, apply'd to the Emperor Charles V. for a Jewish physician from Spain. Finding that the person sent had been converted to Christianity, the King refused to employ him; as if a Jew were to lose his skill upon being converted to Christianity. Why did not the King order one of his own physicians to be converted to Judaism? The following childish argument is built upon an extreme slight relation, that between our Saviour, and the wooden cross he suffered on. "Believe me," says Julius Firmicus, "that the devil omits nothing to destroy miserable mortals; converting himself into every different form, and employing every sort of artifice. He appoints wood to be used in sacrificing to him, knowing that our Saviour, fixed to the cross, would bestow immortality upon all his followers. A pine-tree is cut down, and used in sacrificing to the mother of the gods. A wooden image of Osiris is buried in sacrificing to Isis. A wooden image of Proserpina is bemoaned for forty nights, and then thrown into the flames. Deluded mortals, these flames can do you no service. On the contrary, the fire that is destined for your punishment rages without end. Learn from me to know that divine wood which will set you free. A wooden ark saved the human race from the universal deluge. Abraham put wood upon the shoulders of his son Isaac. The wooden rod stretched out by Aaron brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt. Wood sweetened the bitter waters of Marah, and comforted the children of Israel after wandering

dering three days without water. A wooden rod struck water
 "out of the rock. The rod of God in the hand of Moses over-
 "came Amalek. The patriarch dreamed, that he saw angels de-
 "scending and ascending upon a wooden ladder: and the law of
 "God was inclosed in a wooden ark. These things were exhi-
 "bited, that, as if it were by certain steps, we might ascend to
 "the wood of the cross, which is our salvation. The wood of the
 "cross sustains the heavenly machine, supports the foundations
 "of the earth, and leads men to eternal life. The wood of the devil
 "burns and perishes, and its ashes carries down sinners to the
 "lowest pit of hell." The very slightest relations make an impress-
 "ion on a weak understanding. It was a fancy of Antoninus Ceta,
 in ordering his table, to have services composed of dishes begin-
 "ning with the same letter; such as lamb and lobster; broth, beef,
 blood-pudding; pork, plumbcake, pigeons, potatoes. The name
 of John King of Scotland was changed into *Robert*, for no better
 reason, than that the Johns of France and of England had been
 unfortunate.

In reasoning, instances are not rare, of mistaking the cause for
 the effect, and the effect for the cause. When a stone is thrown
 from the hand, the continuance of its motion in the air, was once
 uniyersally accounted for as follows: "That the air follows the
 "stone at the heels, and pushes it on." The effect here is mista-
 ken for the cause: the air indeed follows the stone at the heels;
 but it only fills the vacuity made by the stone, and does not push
 it on. It has been slyly urged against the art of physic, that phy-
 sicians are rare among temperate people, such as have no wants
 but those of nature; and that where physicians abound, diseases
 abound. This is mistaking the cause for the effect, and the effect
 for the cause: people in health have no occasion for a physician;
 but indolence and luxury beget diseases, and diseases beget phy-
 sicians.

During the nonage of reason, men are satisfied with words merely, instead of an argument. A sea-prospect bounded is charming; but we soon tire of an unbounded prospect. It would not give satisfaction to say, that it is too extensive; for why should not a prospect be relished, however extensive? But employ a foreign term and say, that it is *trop vaste*, we enquire no farther: a term that is not familiar, makes an impression, and captivates weak reason. This observation accounts for a mode of writing formerly in common use, that of stuffing our language with Latin words and phrases. These are now laid aside as useless; because a proper emphasis in reading, makes an impression deeper than any foreign term can do.

There is one proof of the imbecility of human reason in dark times, which would scarce be believed, were not the fact supported by incontestable evidence. Instead of explaining any natural appearance by searching for a cause, it has been common to account for it by inventing a fable, which gave satisfaction without enquiring farther. For example, instead of giving the true cause of the succession of day and night, the sacred book of the Scandinavians, termed *Edda*, accounts for that succession by a tale: "The giant Nor had a daughter named *Night*, of a dark complexion. She was wedded to *Daglingar*, of the family of the gods. They had a male child, which they named *Day*, beautiful and shining like all of his father's family. The universal father took *Night* and *Day*, placed them in heaven, and gave them two horses and two cars, that they might travel round the world, the one after the other. *Night* goes first upon her horse named *Rimfaxe*, [Frosty Mane], who moistens the earth with the foam that drops from his bit, which is the dew. The horse belonging to *Day* is named *Skinfaxe*, [Shining Mane], who by his radiant mane illuminates the air" and

“and the earth.” It is observed by the translator of the Edda, that this way of accounting for things is well suited to the turn of the human mind, which is endowed with curiosity that is extremely keen, but easily satisfied, often with words instead of ideas. Zoroaster, by a similar fable, accounts for the growth of evil in this world. He invents a good and an evil principle named *Oromazes* and *Arimanes*, who are in continual conflict for preference. At the last day, *Oromazes* will be reunited to the supreme God, from whom he issued; *Arimanes* will be subdued, darkness destroyed; and the world, purified by an universal conflagration, will become a luminous and shining abode, from which evil will be excluded. I return to the Edda, which is stored with fables of this kind. The highest notion savages can form of the gods, is that of men endowed with extraordinary power and knowledge. The only puzzling circumstance is, how they differ so much from man as to be immortal. The Edda accounts for this by the following fable. “The gods prevented the effect of old age and decay, by continuing to eat certain apples, trusted to the care of *Iduna*. *Loke*, the *Momus* of the Scandinavians, craftily conveyed away *Iduna*, and concealed her in a wood, under the custody of a giant. The gods beginning to wax old and gray, detected the author of the theft; and, by terrible menaces, compelled him to employ his utmost cunning, for regaining *Iduna* and her apples, in which he was successful.” The origin of poetry is thus accounted for in the same work: “The gods formed *Cuaser*, who traversed the earth, teaching wisdom to men. He was treacherously slain by two dwarfs, who, mixing honey with his blood, composed a liquor that renders all who drink of it poets. These dwarfs having incurred the resentment of a certain giant, were exposed by him upon a rock, surrounded on all sides with the sea. They gave for their ran-

“ some

" from the said liquor, which the giant delivered to his daughter
 " *Gunloda*. The precious potion was eagerly fought for by the
 " gods; but how were they to come at it? *Odin*, in the shape
 " of a worm, crept through a crevice into the cavern where the
 " liquor was concealed. Then resuming his natural shape, and
 " obtaining *Gunloda's* consent to take three draughts, he sucked
 " up the whole; and, transforming himself into an eagle, flew
 " away to *Asgard*. The giant, who was a magician, flew with
 " all speed after *Odin*, and came up with him near the gate of
 " *Asgard*. The gods issued out of their palaces to assist their ma-
 " ster; and presented to him all the pitchers they could lay hands
 " on, which he instantly filled with the precious liquor. But in
 " the hurry of discharging his load, *Odin* poured only part of the
 " liquor through his beak, the rest being emitted through a less
 " pure vent. The former is bestow'd by the gods upon good
 " poets, to inspire them with divine enthusiasm. The latter,
 " which is in much greater plenty, is bestow'd liberally on all
 " who apply for it; by which means the world is pestered with
 " an endless quantity of wretched verses." Ignorance is equally
 credulous in all ages. *Albert*, surnamed *the Great*, flourished in
 the thirteenth century, and was a man of real knowledge. Dur-
 ring the course of his education he was remarkably dull; and
 some years before he died became a sort of changeling. That sin-
 gularity produced the following history: That the holy Virgin, ap-
 pearing to him, demanded, whether he would excel in philosophy
 or in theology; that upon his chusing the former, she promised,
 that he should become an incomparable philosopher; but added,
 that to punish him for not preferring theology, he should become
 stupid again as at first.

Upon a slight view, it may appear unaccountable, that even
 the grossest savages should take a childish tale for a solid reason.
 But nature aids the deception: where things are related in a lively

ly

ly manner, and every circumstance appears as passing in our sight, we take all for granted as true (a). Can an ignorant rustic doubt of inspiration, when he sees as it were the poet sipping the pure celestial liquor? And how can that poet fail to produce bad verses, who feeds on the excrements that drop from the fundament even of a deity?

In accounting for natural appearances, even good writers have betray'd a weakness in reasoning, little inferior to that above mentioned. They do not indeed put off their disciples with a tale; but they put them off with a mere supposition, not more real than the tale. Descartes ascribes the motion of the planets to a vortex of ether whirling round and round. He thought not of enquiring whether there really be such a vortex, nor what makes it move. M. Buffon forms the earth out of a splinter of the sun, struck off by a comet. May not one be permitted humbly to enquire at that eminent philosopher, what formed the comet? This passes for solid reasoning; and yet we laugh at the poor Indian, who supports the earth from falling by an elephant, and the elephant by a tortoise.

It is still more ridiculous to reason upon what is acknowledged to be a fiction, as if it were real. Such are the fictions admitted in the Roman law. A Roman taken captive in war, lost his privilege of being a Roman citizen; for freedom was held essential to that privilege. But what if he made his escape, after perhaps an hour's detention? The hardship in that case ought to have suggested an alteration of the law, which was, to suspend the privilege no longer than the captivity subsisted. But the ancient Romans were not so ingenious. They remedied the hardship by a fiction, that the man never had been a captive. The Frederician code banishes from the law of Prussia an endless number of

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 100, edit. 5.

fictions that are found in the Roman law (Preface, sect. 28.). Yet afterward, treating of personal rights, it is laid down as a rule, That a child in the womb is feigned or supposed to be born when the fiction is for its advantage (part 1. b. 1. tit. 4. sect. 4.). To a weak reasoner a fiction is a happy contrivance for resolving intricate questions. Such is the constitution of England, that the English law-courts are merely territorial; and that no fact happening abroad comes under their cognifance. An Englishman, after murdering his fellow-traveller in France, returns to his native country. What is to be done? for guilt ought not to pass unpunished. The crime is feigned to have been committed in England, and the offender is punished accordingly.

Ancient histories are full of incredible facts that passed current during the infancy of reason, which at present would be rejected with contempt. Every man who is conversant in the history of ancient nations, can recall instances without end. Does any one believe at present, tho' gravely reported by historians, that in old Rome there was a law, for cutting into pieces the body of a bankrupt, and distributing the parts among his creditors? The story of Porfenna and Scevola is highly romantic; and the story of Vampires in Hungary, shamefully absurd. There is no reason to believe, that there ever was such a state as that of the Amazons; and the story of Thalestris and Alexander the Great is undoubtedly a fiction. Scotch historians describe gravely and circumstantially the battle of Luncarty, as if they had been eye-witnesses. A country-man and his two sons, it is said, were ploughing in an adjacent field, during the heat of the action. Enraged at their countrymen for turning their backs, they broke the plough in pieces; and each laying hold of a part, rushed into the midst of the battle, and obtained a complete victory over the Danes. This story has every mark of fiction: A man following out unconcernedly his ordinary occupation of ploughing, in

fight

fight of a battle, on which depended his wife and children, his goods, and perhaps his own life. More, Three men, without rank or figure, with only a stick in the hand of each, stemming the tide of victory, and turning the fate of battle. I mention not that a plough was unknown in Scotland for a century or two after that battle; for that circumstance could not create a doubt in the historian, if he was ignorant of it. Reason, with respect to its progress, is singular. Morals, manners, and every thing that appears externally, may in part be acquired by imitation and example, which have not the slightest influence upon the reasoning faculty. The only means for advancing that faculty to maturity, are indefatigable study and practice; and even these will not carry a man one step beyond the subjects he is conversant about: examples are not rare of men extremely expert in one science, and grossly deficient in others. Many able mathematicians are novices in politics, and even in the common arts of life. Study and practice have ripened them in every relation of equality, while they remain ignorant, like the vulgar, about other relations. A man, in like manner, who has bestowed much time and thought in political matters, may be a child as to other branches of knowledge.

I proceed to the second article, containing erroneous reasoning

* Pascal, the celebrated author of *Lettres Provinciales*, in order to explain the infinity and indivisibility of the Deity, has the following words. "I will show you a thing both infinite and indivisible. It is a point moving with infinite celerity; that point is in all places at once, and entire in every place." What an absurdity, says Voltaire, to ascribe motion to a mathematical point, that has no existence but in the mind of the geometer! that it can be every where at the same instant, and that it can move with infinite celerity! as if infinite celerity could actually exist. Every word, adds he, is big with absurdity; and yet he was a great man who uttered that stuff.

VOL. II. S occasioned

occasioned by natural biases. The first bias I shall mention has an extensive influence. What is seen, makes a deeper impression, than what is heard by report, or discovered by reflection. Hence it is, that in judging of right and wrong, the external act only draws the attention of the ignorant and illiterate, who cannot penetrate into will or intention; and hence it is, that in religion great weight is laid upon forms and ceremonies, without much regarding their purpose. These particulars come in afterward, in the progress of morality and religion. What belongs to the present sketch is to observe, that in judging of covenants, laws, vows, and other acts that are completed by words, the whole weight in days of ignorance is laid upon the external expression, with no regard to the meaning of the speaker or writer. The blessing bestow'd by Isaac upon his son Jacob, mistaking him for Esau, is an illustrious instance. Not only was the blessing intended for Esau, but Jacob, by deceiving his father, had rendered himself unworthy of it (a); yet Isaac had pronounced the sounds, and it was not in his power to unsay them: *Nescit vox emissa reverti*. Joshua, grossly imposed on by the Gibeonites denying that they were Canaanites, made a covenant with them; and yet, tho' he found them to be Canaanites, he held himself to be bound. Led by the same bias, people think it sufficient to fulfil the words of a vow, however short of intention. The Duke of Lancaster, vexed at the obstinate resistance of Rennes, a town in Britany, vowed in wrath not to raise the siege till he had planted the English colours upon one of the gates. This proved a rash vow. He found it necessary to raise the siege, but his vow stood in the way. The governor relieved him from his scruple, permitting him to plant his colours upon one of the gates; and he was satisfied that his vow was fulfilled. The following is an example of an absurd

(a) Genesis, chap. 27.

conclusion deduced from a precept taken literally, against common sense. We are ordered by the Apostle, to pray always; from which Jerom, one of the fathers, argues thus: "Conjugal enjoyment is inconsistent with praying; *ergo*, conjugal enjoyment is "a sin." By the same argument it may be proved, that eating and drinking are sins; and that sleeping is a great sin, being a great interruption to praying. With respect to another text, viz. "That a bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife," taken literally, a very different conclusion is drawn in Abyssinia, viz. That no man can be ordained a presbyter till he be married. Prohibitions have been interpreted in the same shallow manner. Clarendon gives two instances, both of them relative to the great fire of London. The mayor proposing to pull down a house in order to stop the progress of the fire, was opposed by the lawyers, who declared the act to be unlawful; and the house was burnt without being pulled down. About the same time it was proposed to break open some houses in the temple for saving the furniture, the possessors being in the country; but it was declared burglary to force open a door without consent of the possessor. Such literal interpretation, contrary to common sense, has been extended even to inflict punishment. Ifadas was bathing when the alarm was given in Lacedemon, that Epaminondas was at hand with a numerous army. Naked as he was, he rushed against the enemy with a spear in one hand and a sword in the other, bearing down all before him. The Ephori fined him for going to battle unarmed; but honoured him with a garland for his gallant behaviour. How absurd to think that the law was intended for such a case! and how much more absurd to think, that the same act ought to be both punished and rewarded! The King of Castile being carried off his horse by a hunted hart, was saved by a person at hand, who cut his belt. The judges thought a pardon absolutely requisite, to relieve from capital punishment a

man who had lifted a sword against his sovereign *. It is a salutary regulation, that a man who is absent cannot be tried for his life. Pope Formosus died suddenly without suffering any punishment for his crimes. But this did not save his goods from confiscation: he was dug out of his grave, dressed in his pontifical habit; and in that shape a criminal process went on against him. Could it seriously be thought, that a rotten carcase brought into court was sufficient to fulfil the law? The same absurd farce was played in Scotland, upon the body of Logan of Restalrig, several years after his interment. The body of Tancred King of Sicily was raised from the grave, and the head cut off for supposed rebellion. Henry IV. of Castile was deposed in absence; but, for a colour of justice, the following ridiculous scene was acted. A wooden statue dressed in a royal habit, was placed on a theatre; and the sentence of deposition was solemnly read to it, as if it had been the King himself. The Archbishop of Toledo seized the crown, another the sceptre, a third the sword; and the ceremony was concluded with proclaiming another king. How humbling are such scenes to man, who values himself upon the faculty of reason as his prime attribute! An expedient of that kind would now be rejected with disdain, as fit only to amuse children; and yet it grieves me to observe that law-proceedings are not yet totally purged of such dross. By a law in Holland, the criminal's confession is essential to a capital punishment, no meaner evidence being held sufficient: and yet if he insist on his innocence, he is tortured till he pronounce the words of confession; as if sounds merely were sufficient, without will or intention. The practice of England in a similar case, is no less absurd. Confes-

* A person unacquainted with the history of law, will imagine that Swift has carried beyond all bounds his satire against lawyers, in saying, that Gulliver had incurred a capital punishment, for saving the Emperor's palace by pissing out the fire; it being capital in any person of what quality soever, to make water within the precincts of the palace.

sion is not there required; but it is required, that the person accused should plead, and say whether he is innocent or guilty. But what if he stand mute? He is pressed down by weights till he plead; and if he continue mute, he is pressed till he give up the ghost, a torture known by the name of *Peine forte et dure* *. Further, law copying religion, has exalted ceremonies above the substantial part. In England, so strictly has form been adhered to, as to make the most trivial defect in words fatal, however certain the meaning may be. *Murdredavit* for *murdravit*, *feloniter* for *felonice*, have been adjudged to vitiate an indictment. *Burgariter* for *burglariter* hath been a fatal objection; but *burgulariter* hath been holden good. Webster being indicted for murder, and the stroke being laid "*sinistro bracio*" instead of "*brachio*," he was dismissed. *A. B. alias dictus A. C. Butcher*, was found to vitiate the indictment; because it ought to have been *A. B. Butcher, alias dictus A. C. Butcher*. So *gladium in dextra sua*, without *manu*.

There is no bias in human nature more prevalent than an appetite to anticipate futurity, by being made acquainted beforehand with what will happen. That appetite was indulged without reserve in dark times; and hence omens, auguries, dreams, judicial astrology, oracles, and prophecies, without end. It shows strange weakness in the rational faculty, not to see, that such foreknowledge would be a gift more pernicious to man than Pandora's box: it would deprive him of every motive to action; and leave no place for sagacity, nor for contriving means to bring about a desired event. Life is an enchanted castle, that gives play to passions, and exercise to reason: remove the veil that hides futurity—behold the enchanted castle gone, and in its stead a

* Since the above was written, an act of parliament has been passed, by which the legislature, sensible of the absurdity of the old law, has enacted, That persons arraigned for felony or piracy, who stand mute, or refuse to answer directly to the indictment, shall be held as confessing, and judgement shall pass against them, as if they had been convicted by verdict or confession.

barren and insipid prospect. Anxiety about futurity rouses our sagacity to prepare for what may happen; but an appetite to know what sagacity cannot discover, is a weakness in nature inconsistent with every rational principle*.

An appetite for things rare and wonderful, is a natural bias no less universal than the former. Any strange or unaccountable event rouses the attention, and enflames the mind: we suck it in greedily, wish it to be true, and believe it to be true upon the slightest evidence; because such belief gratifies the appetite. A hart taken in the forest of Senlis by Charles VI. of France, bore a collar upon which was inscribed, *Cæsar hoc me donavit* †. The appetite for wonder made every one believe, that a Roman Emperor was meant, and that the beast must have lived at least a thousand years; overlooking that the Emperor of Germany is also styled *Cæsar*, and that it was not necessary to go back fifty years. This appetite displays itself even in childhood: stories of ghosts and apparitions are anxiously listened to; and firmly believed, by means of the terror they occasion: and the vulgar accordingly have been captivated with such stories, upon evidence that would not be sufficient to ascertain the simplest fact (a). The absurd and childish prodigies that are every where scattered through the history of Titus Livius, not to mention other ancient historians, would be unaccountable in a writer of sense and gravity, were it not for the appetite mentioned. But human belief is not left at the mercy of every irregular bias. Our maker has subjected belief to the correction of the rational faculty; and accordingly, in proportion as reason advances toward maturity, wonders, prodigies,

* Foreknowledge of future events, differs widely from a conviction, that all events are fixed and immutable: the latter leaves us free to activity; the former annihilates all activity.

† "Cæsar gave me this."

(a) Elements of Criticism, ch. 2. part 5,

gies, apparitions, incantations, witchcraft, and such stuff, lose their influence. That reformation however has been exceedingly slow, because the appetite is exceedingly strong. Such absurdities found credit among wise men, even as late as the last age. I am ready to verify the charge, by introducing two men of the first rank for understanding: were a greater number necessary, there would be no difficulty of making a very bulky list. The celebrated Grotius shall lead the van. Procopius, in his Vandal history, relates, that some orthodox Christians, whose tongues were cut out by the Arians, continued miraculously to speak as formerly. And to vouch the fact, he appeals to some of those miraculous persons, alive in Constantinople at the time of his writing. In the dark ages of Christianity, when different sects were violently enflamed against each other, it is not surprising, that gross absurdities were swallowed as real miracles: but is it not surprising, and equally mortifying, to find Grotius, the greatest genius of the age he lived in, adopting such absurdities? For the truth of the foregoing miracle, he appeals not only to Procopius, but to several other writers (a); as if the hearsay of a few writers were sufficient to make us believe an impossibility. Could it seriously be his opinion, that the great God, who governs by general laws, permitting the sun to shine alike upon men of every religion, would miraculously suspend the laws of nature, in order to testify his displeasure at an honest sect of Christians, however erroneous their tenets may be? Did he also believe what Procopius adds, that two of these orthodox Christians were again deprived of speech, as a punishment inflicted by the Almighty for cohabiting with prostitutes?

I proceed to our famous historian, the Earl of Clarendon, the other person I had in view. A man long in public business, a

(a) Prolegomena to his History of the Goths.

consummate politician, and well stored with knowledge from books as well as from experience, might be fortified against foolish miracles, if any man can be fortified: and yet behold his superstitious credulity in childish stories; no less weak in that particular, than was his cotemporary Grotius. He gravely relates an incident regarding the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham, the sum of which follows. "There were many stories scattered abroad at that time, of prophecies and predictions of the Duke's untimely and violent death; one of which was upon a better foundation of credit, than usually such discourses are founded upon. There was an officer in the King's wardrobe in Windsor castle, of reputation for honesty and discretion, and at that time about the age of fifty. About six months before the miserable end of the Duke, this man being in bed, and in good health, there appeared to him at midnight a man of a venerable aspect, who drawing the curtains, and fixing his eye upon him, said, Do you know me, Sir. The poor man, half dead with fear, answered, That he thought him to be Sir George Villiers, father to the Duke. Upon which he was ordered by the apparition, to go to the Duke, and tell him, that if he did not somewhat to ingratiate himself with the people, he would be suffered to live but a short time. The same person appeared to him a second and a third time, reproaching him bitterly for not performing his promise. The poor man pluck'd up as much courage as to excuse himself, that it was difficult to find access to the Duke, and that he would be thought a madman. The apparition imparted to him some secrets, which he said would be his credentials to the Duke. The officer, introduced to the Duke by Sir Ralph Freeman, was received courteously. They walked together near an hour; and the Duke sometimes spoke with great commotion, tho' his servants, with Sir Ralph, were at such a distance that they could not hear a word. The officer, returning

“returning from the Duke, told Sir Ralph, that when he mentioned the particulars that were to gain him credit, the Duke’s colour changed; and he swore the officer could come to that knowledge only by the devil; for that these particulars were known only to himself, and to one person more, of whose fidelity he was secure. The Duke, who went to accompany the King at hunting, was observed to ride all the morning in deep thought; and before the morning was spent, left the field, and alighted at his mother’s house, with whom he was shut up for two or three hours. When the Duke left her, his countenance appeared full of trouble, with a mixture of anger, which never appeared before in conversing with her: and she was found overwhelmed with tears, and in great agony. Whatever there was of all this, it is a notorious truth, that when she heard of the Duke’s murder, she seemed not in the least surpris’d, nor did express much sorrow.”

The name of Lord Clarendon calls for more attention to the foregoing incident than otherwise it would deserve. It is no article of the Christian faith, that the dead preserve their connection with the living, or are ever suffered to return to this world: we have no solid evidence for such a fact; nor ever hear of it, except in tales for amusing or terrifying children. Secondly, The story is inconsistent with the course of Providence, which, for the best purposes, has drawn an impenetrable veil between us and futurity. Thirdly, This apparition, tho’ supposed to be endowed with a miraculous knowledge of future events, is however deficient in the sagacity that belongs to a person of ordinary understanding. It appears twice to the officer, without thinking of giving him proper credentials; nor does it at all think of them till suggested by the officer. Fourthly, Why did not the apparition go directly to the Duke himself; where could be the necessity of employing a third person? The Duke must have been much more affected

with an apparition to himself, than by hearing it at second hand. The officer was afraid of being taken for a madman; and the Duke had some reason to think him such. Lastly, The apparition happened above three months before the Duke's death; and yet we hear not of a single step taken by him, in pursuance of the advice given him. The authority of the historian, and the regard we owe him, have drawn from me the foregoing reflections; which with respect to the story itself are very little necessary; for the evidence is really not such as to verify any ordinary occurrence. His Lordship acknowledges, that he had no evidence but common report, saying, that it was one of the many stories scattered about at that time. He does not say, that the story was related to him by the officer, whose name he does not even mention, or by Sir Ralph Freeman, or by the Duke's mother, or by the Duke himself. If ever any thing happened like the story in question, it may with good reason be supposed, that the officer was crazy, or enthusiastically mad: nor have we any evidence beyond common report, that he communicated any secrets to the Duke. I shall only add upon this article, that here are two remarkable instances of an observation made above, that a man may be high in one science and very low in another. Had Grotius, or had Clarendon, studied the fundamentals of reason and religion coolly and impartially, as they did other sciences, they would never have given faith to reports so ill vouched, and so contradictory to every sound principle of theology.

Another source of erroneous reasoning is, a singular tendency in the mind of man to mysteries and hidden meanings. The busy mind is seldom satisfied with the simple and obvious intendment, where the object makes a deep impression: invention is roused to allegorize, and to pierce into hidden views and purposes. I have a notable example at hand, with respect to forms and ceremonies in

in religious worship. Josephus (a), talking of the tabernacle, has the following passage. "Let any man consider the structure of the tabernacle, the sacerdotal vestments, the vessels dedicated to the service of the altar; and he must of necessity be convinced, that our lawgiver was a pious man, and that all the clamours against us and our profession, are mere calumny. For what are all of these but the image of the whole world? This will appear to any man who soberly and impartially examines the matter. The tabernacle of thirty cubits is divided into three parts; two for the priests in general, and as free to them as the earth and the sea; the third, where no mortal must be admitted, is as the heaven, reserved for God himself. The twelve loaves of shew-bread signify the twelve months of the year. The candlestick, composed of seven branches, refers to the twelve signs of the zodiac, through which the seven planets shape their course; and the seven lamps on the top of the seven branches bear an analogy to the planets themselves. The curtains of four colours represent the four elements. The fine linen signifies the earth, as flax is raised there. By the purple is understood the sea, from the blood of the murex, which dies that colour. The violet colour is a symbol of the air; and the scarlet of the fire. By the linen garment of the high-priest, is designed the whole body of the earth: by the violet colour the heavens. The pomegranates signify lightning: the bells tolling signify thunder. The four-coloured ephod bears a resemblance to the very nature of the universe, and the interweaving it with gold has a regard to the rays of light. The girdle about the body of the priest is as the sea about the globe of the earth. The two sardonyx stones are a kind of figure of the sun and moon; and the twelve other stones may be understood, either

(a) Jewish Antiquities, book 3.

“ of the twelve months, or of the twelve signs in the zodiac. The
“ violet-coloured riara is a resemblance of heaven ; and it would
“ be irreverent to have written the sacred name of God upon any
“ other colour. The triple crown and plate of gold give us to
“ understand the glory and majesty of Almighty God. This is a
“ plain illustration of these matters ; and I would not lose any
“ opportunity of doing justice to the honour and wisdom of our
“ incomparable lawgiver.” How much wire-drawn, and how
remote from any appearance of truth, are the foregoing allusions
and imagined resemblances ! But religious forms and ceremonies,
however arbitrary, are never held to be so. If an useful purpose
do not appear, it is taken for granted, that there must be a hidden
meaning ; and any meaning, however childish, will serve at a
pinch. Such propensity there is in dark ages for allegorizing, that
even our Saviour’s miracles have not escaped. Where-ever any
seeming difficulty occurs in the plain sense, the fathers of the
church, Origen, Augustine, and Hilary, are never at a loss for a
mystic meaning. “ Sacrifice to the celestial gods with an odd
“ number, and to the terrestrial gods with an even number,” is a
precept of Pythagoras. Another is, “ Turn round in adoring the
“ gods, and sit down when thou hast worshipped.” The learned
make a strange bustle about the hidden meaning of these precepts.
But, after all, have they any hidden meaning ? Forms and cere-
monies are useful in external worship, for occupying the vulgar ;
and it is of no importance what they are, provided they prevent
the mind from wandering. Why such partiality to ancient cere-
monies, when no hidden meaning is supposed in those of Chri-
stians, such as bowing to the east, or the priest performing the li-
turgy, partly in a black upper garment, partly in a white. No
ideas are more simple than of numbers, nor less susceptible of a-
ny hidden meaning ; and yet the profound Pythagoras has ima-
gined many such meanings. The number *one*, says he, having

no

no parts, represents the Deity : it represents also order, peace, and tranquillity, which result from unity of sentiment. The number *two* represents disorder, confusion, and change. He discovered in the number *three* the most sublime mysteries : all things are composed, says he, of three substances. The number *four* is holy in its nature, and constitutes the divine essence, which consists in unity, power, benevolence, and wisdom. Would one believe, that the great philosopher, who demonstrated the 47th proposition of the first book of Euclid, was the inventor of such childish conceits ? Perhaps Pythagoras meant only to divert himself with them. Whether so or not, it seems difficult to be explained, how such trifles were preserved in memory, and handed down to us through so many generations. All that can be said is, that during the infancy of knowledge, every novelty makes a figure, and that it requires a long course of time to separate the corn from the chaff*. A certain writer, smitten with the conceit of hidden meanings, has applied his talent to the constellations of the zodiac. The *lion* typifies the force or heat of the sun in the month of July, when he enters that constellation. The constellation where the sun is in the month of August is termed the *virgin*, signifying the time of harvest. He enters the *balance* in September, denoting the equality of day and night. The *scorpion*, where he is found in October, is an emblem of the diseases that are frequent during that month, &c. The *balance*, I acknowledge, is well hit

* The following precepts of the same philosopher, tho' now only fit for the *Child's Guide*, were originally cherished, and preserved in memory, as emanations of superior wisdom. "Do not enter a temple for worship, but with a decent air. "Render not life painful by undertaking too many affairs. Be always ready for "what may happen. Never bind yourself by a vow, nor by an oath. Irritate "not a man who is angry." The seven wise men of Greece made a figure in their time ; but it would be unreasonable to expect, that what they taught during the infancy of knowledge, should make a figure in its maturity.

off; but I see not clearly the resemblance of the force of a lion to the heat of the sun; and still less that of harvest to a virgin: the spring would be more happily represented by a virgin, and the harvest by a woman in the act of delivery.

The tendency in the mind of man to mysteries and allegories, displays itself with great vigour upon our forefathers, and upon the ancients in general, by means of the great veneration that is paid them. Before writing was known, ancient history is made up of traditional fables. A Trojan Brutus peopled England; and the Scots are descended from Scota, daughter to an Egyptian king. What reason have we to doubt but that histories of the heathen gods are equally involved in fable? We pretend not to draw any hidden meaning from the former: why should we suspect any such meaning in the latter? Allegory is a species of writing too refined for a savage or barbarian: it is the fruit of a cultivated imagination; and was a late invention even in Greece. The allegories of Esop are of the simplest kind, and yet they were composed after learning began to flourish; and Cebes, whose allegory about the life of man is justly celebrated, was a disciple of Socrates. Prepossession however in favour of the ancients makes us conclude, that there must be some hidden meaning or allegory in their historical fables; for no better reason than that they are destitute of common sense. In the Greek mythology, there are numberless fables related as historical facts merely; witness the fable of gods mixing with women, and procreating giants, like what we find in the fabulous histories of many other nations; these giants attempting to dethrone Jupiter; Apollo keeping the sheep of Admetus; Minerva springing from the head of Jove*; Bacchus

* However easy it may be to draw an allegorical meaning out of that fable, I cannot admit any such meaning to have been intended. An allegory is a fable contrived

Bacchus cut out of his thigh; Orpheus going to hell for his wife; Mars and Venus caught by Vulcan in a net; and a thousand other such childish stories. But the Greeks, many centuries after the invention of such foolish fables, becoming illustrious for arts and sciences, nothing would satisfy writers in later times, but to dub them profound philosophers even in their cradle, when mere savages; and hence endless attempts to detect mysteries and hidden meanings in their fables. Let other interpreters of that kind pass; they give me no concern: but I cannot, without the deepest concern, behold our illustrious philosopher Bacon employing his talents so absurdly. What imbecility must there be in human nature, when so great a genius is capable of such puerilities! As a subject so humbling is far from being agreeable, I confine myself to a few instances. In an ancient fable, Prometheus formed man out of clay; and kindling a bundle of birch rods at the chariot of the sun, brought down fire to the earth for the use of his creature man. And tho' ungrateful man complained to Jupiter of that theft, yet the god, pleased with the ingenuity of Prometheus, not only confirmed to man the use of fire, but conferred on him a gift much more considerable: the gift was perpetual youth, which was laid upon an ass to be carried to the earth. The ass, wanting to drink at a brook, was opposed by a serpent, who insisted to have the burden, without which, no drink for the poor ass. And thus, for a draught of plain water, was perpetual youth transferred from man to the serpent. This fable has a striking resemblance to many in the Edda; and, in the

trived to illustrate some acknowledged truth, by making a deeper impression than the truth would make in plain words; of which we have several beautiful instances in the Spectator (Elements of Criticism, chap. 20. § 6.). But the fable here was understood to be a matter of fact, Minerva being worshipped by the Greeks as a real goddess, the daughter of Jupiter without a mother.

manner

manner of the Edda, accounts for the invention of fire, and for the mortality of man. Nor is there in all the Edda one more childish, or more distant from any appearance of a rational meaning. It is handled however by our philosopher, with much solemn gravity, as if every source of wisdom were locked up in it. The explanation he gives, being too long to be copied here, shall be reduced to a few particulars. After an elogium upon fire, his Lordship proceeds thus. "The manner wherein Prometheus stole his fire, is properly described from the nature of the thing; he being said to have done it by applying a rod of birch to the chariot of the sun: for birch is used in striking and beating; which clearly denotes fire to proceed from violent percussions and collisions of bodies, whereby the matters struck are subtilized, rarefied, put into motion, and so prepared to receive the heat of the celestial bodies. And accordingly they, in a clandestine and secret manner, snatch fire, as it were by stealth, from the chariot of the sun." He goes on as follows. "The next is a remarkable part of the fable; which represents, that men, instead of gratitude, accused both Prometheus and his fire to Jupiter: and yet the accusation proved so pleasant to Jupiter, that he not only indulged mankind the use of fire, but conferred upon them perpetual youth. Here it may seem strange, that the sin of ingratitude should meet with approbation or reward. But the allegory has another view; and denotes, that the accusation both of human nature and human art, proceeds from a noble and laudable temper of mind, viz. modesty; and also tends to a very good purpose, viz. to stir up fresh industry and new discoveries." Can any thing be more wire-drawn?

Vulcan, attempting the chastity of Minerva, had recourse to force. In the struggle, his *semen*, falling upon the ground, produced Eriethonius; whose body from the middle upward was comely

comely and well proportioned, his thighs and legs small and deformed like an eel. Conscious of that defect, he was the inventor of chariots; which showed the graceful part of his body, and concealed what was deformed. Listen to the explanation of this ridiculous fable. "Art, by the various uses it makes of fire, is here represented by Vulcan: and Nature is represented by Minerva, because of the industry employ'd in her works. Art, when it offers violence to Nature in order to bend her to its purpose, seldom attains the end proposed. Yet, upon great struggle and application, there proceed certain imperfect births, or lame abortive works; which however, with great pomp and deceitful appearances, are triumphantly carried about, and shown by impostors." I admit the ingenuity of that forc'd meaning; but had the inventor of that fable any latent meaning? If he had, why did he conceal it? The ingenious meaning would have merited praise; the fable itself none at all.

I shall add but one other instance, for they grow tiresome. Sphinx was a monster, having the face and voice of a virgin, the wings of a bird, and the talons of a gryphon. She resided on the summit of a mountain, near the city Thebes. Her manner was, to lie in ambush for travellers, to propose dark riddles which she received from the Muses, and to tear those to pieces who could not solve them. The Thebans having offered their kingdom to the man who should interpret these riddles, Oedipus presented himself before the monster, and he was required to explain the following riddle, viz. What creature is that, which being born four-footed, becomes afterwards two-footed, then three-footed, and lastly four-footed again. Oedipus answered, It was man, who in his infancy crawls upon his hands and feet, then walks upright upon his two feet, walks in old age with a stick, and at last lies four-footed in bed. Oedipus having thus obtained the victory, slew the monster; and laying the carcase upon an ass,

carried it off in triumph. Now for the explanation. " This is
 " an elegant and instructive fable, invented to represent science :
 " for Science may be called a monster, being strangely gazed at
 " and admired by the ignorant. Her figure and form is various,
 " by reason of the vast variety of subjects that science considers.
 " Her voice and countenance are represented female, by reason
 " of her gay appearance, and volubility of speech. Wings are
 " added, because the sciences and their inventions fly about in
 " a moment ; for knowledge, like light communicated from
 " torch to torch, is presently caught, and copiously diffused.
 " Sharp and hooked talons are elegantly attributed to her ; be-
 " cause the axioms and arguments of science fix down the
 " mind, and keep it from moving or slipping away." Again :
 " All science seems placed on high, as it were on the tops of
 " mountains that are hard to climb ; for science is justly imagi-
 " ned a sublime and lofty thing, looking down upon ignorance,
 " and at the same time taking an extensive view on all sides, as
 " is usual on the tops of mountains. Sphinx is said to propose
 " difficult questions and riddles, which she received from the
 " Muses. These questions, while they remain with the Muses,
 " may be pleasant, as contemplation and enquiry are when know-
 " ledge is their only aim : but after they are delivered to Sphinx,
 " that is, to practice, which impels to action, choice, and deter-
 " mination ; then it is that they become severe and torturing ;
 " and unless solved, strangely perplex the human mind, and tear
 " it to pieces. It is with the utmost elegance added in the fable,
 " that the carcass of Sphinx was laid upon an ass ; for there is
 " nothing so subtle and abstruse, but after being made plain, may
 " be conceived by the slowest capacity." According to such la-
 " ritude of interpretation, there is nothing more easy than to make
quidlibet ex quolibet.

" Who

“Who would not laugh if such a man there be?”

“Who would not weep if Atticus were he?”

I will detain the reader but a moment longer, to hear what our author says in justification of such mysterious meaning. Out of many reasons, I select the two following. “It may pass for a farther indication of a concealed and secret meaning, that some of these fables are so absurd and idle in their narration, as to proclaim an allegory even afar off. A fable that carries probability with it, may be supposed invented for pleasure, or in imitation of history; but what could never be conceived or related in this way, must surely have a different use. For example, what a monstrous fiction is this, That Jupiter should take *Metis* to wife; and as soon as he found her pregnant eat her up; whereby he also conceived, and out of his head brought forth *Pallas* armed! Certainly no mortal could, but for the sake of the moral it couches, invent such an absurd dream as this, so much out of the road of thought.” At that rate, the more ridiculous or absurd a fable is, the more instructive it must be. This opinion resembles that of the ancient Germans with respect to mad women, who were held to be so wise, as that every thing they uttered was prophetic. Did it never once occur to our author, that in the infancy of the reasoning faculty, the imagination is suffered to range without control, as in a dream; and that the vulgar in all ages are delighted with wonderful stories; the more out of nature, the more to their taste?

We proceed to the other reason. “The argument of most weight with me is, That many of these fables appear not to have been invented by the persons who relate and divulge them, whether Homer, Hesiod, or others; for if I were assured they first flowed from those later times and authors, I should never expect any thing singularly great or noble from such an

“ origin. But whoever attentively considers the thing, will find, “ that these fables are delivered down by those writers, not as “ matters then first invented, but as received and embraced in “ earlier ages. And this principally raises my esteem of those “ fables ; which I receive, not as the product of the age, or invention of the poets, but as sacred relics, gentle whispers, and “ the breath of better times, that from the traditions of more “ ancient nations, came at length into the flutes and trumpets “ of the Greeks.” Was it our author’s real opinion, that the farther back we trace the history of man, the more of science and knowledge is found ; and consequently that savages are the most learned of all men ?

The following fable of the savage Canadians ought to be mysterious, if either of the reasons urged above be conclusive. “ There “ were in the beginning but six men in the world, (from whence “ sprung is not said) : one of these ascended to heaven in quest of “ a woman named *Atabentfic*, and had carnal knowledge of her. “ She being thrown headlong from the height of the empyrean, “ was received on the back of a tortoise, and delivered of two “ children, one of whom slew the other.” This fable is so absurd, that it must have a latent meaning ; and one needs but copy our author to pump a deep mystery out of it, however little intended by the inventor of the fable. And if either absurdity or antiquity entitle fables to be held sacred relics, gentle whispers, and the breath of better times, the following Japanese fables are well entitled to these distinguishing epithets. “ Bunfio, in wedlock, having had no children for many years, addressed her prayers to the gods, was heard, and was delivered of 500 eggs. Fearing that the eggs might produce monsters, she packed them up in a box, and threw them into the river. An old fisherman finding the box, hatched the eggs in an oven, every one of which produced a child. The children were fed with boiled rice and mugwort-leaves ;

leaves; and being at last left to shift for themselves, they fell a-robbing on the highway. Hearing of a man famous for great wealth, they told their story at his gate, and begged some food. This happening to be the house of their mother, she own'd them for her children, and gave a great entertainment to her friends and neighbours. She was afterward inlisted among the goddesses by the name of *Benfaiten*: her 500 sons were appointed to be her attendants; and to this day she is worshipped in Japan as the goddess of riches." Take another fable of the same stamp. The Japanese have a table of lucky and unlucky days, which they believe to have been composed by Abino Seimei, a famous astrologer, and a sort of demi-god. They have the following tradition of him. "A young fox, pursued by hunters, fled into a temple, and took shelter in the bosom of Abino Jassima, son and heir to the king of the country. Refusing to yield the poor creature to the unmerciful hunters, he defended himself with great bravery, and set the fox at liberty. The hunters, through resentment against the young prince, murdered his royal father; but Jassima revenged his father's death, killing the traitors with his own hand. Upon this signal victory, a lady of incomparable beauty appeared to him, and made such an impression on his heart, that he took her to wife. Abino Seimei, procreated of that marriage, was endowed with divine wisdom, and with the precious gift of prophecy. Jassima was ignorant that his wife was the very fox whose life he had saved, till she resumed by degrees her former shape." If there be any hidden mystery in this tale, I shall not despair of finding a mystery in every fairy-tale invented by Madam Gomez.

It is lamentable, how slowly human understanding, and the faculty of reason, creep toward maturity. If this reflection be verified in our celebrated philosopher Bacon, how much more in the bulk of mankind? It is comfortable, however, that human understanding

understanding is in a progress toward maturity, however slow. The fancy of allegorizing ancient fables, is now out of fashion: enlightened reason has unmasked these fables, and left them in their nakedness, as the invention of illiterate ages, when wonder was the prevailing passion.

Having discussed the first two heads, I proceed to the third, viz. Erroneous reasoning, occasioned by acquired biases. And one of these that has the greatest influence in perverting the rational faculty, is blind religious zeal. There is not in nature a system more simple or perspicuous than that of pure religion; and yet what a composition hath it been rendered of metaphysical subtilties, and unintelligible jargon! That subject being too well known to need illustration, I shall confine myself to a few instances of the influence that religious superstition has on other subjects.

A history-painter and a player require the same sort of genius. The one by colours, the other by looks and gestures, expresses various modifications of passion, even what are beyond the reach of words; and to accomplish these ends, great sensibility is requisite, as well as judgement. Why then is not a player equally respected with a history-painter? It was thought by zealots, that a play is an entertainment too splendid for a mortified Christian; upon which account players fell under church-censure, and were held unworthy of Christian burial. A history-painter, on the contrary, being employ'd in painting for the church, was always in high esteem. It is only among Protestants that players are beginning to be restored to their privileges as free citizens; and there perhaps never existed a history-painter more justly esteemed, than Garrick, a player, is in Great Britain. Aristarchus having taught, that the earth moves round the sun, was accused by the Heathen priests, for troubling the repose of their household-gods. Copernicus, for the same doctrine, was accused by Christian priests, as contradicting
the

the scriptures, which talk of the sun's moving. And Galileo, for adhering to Copernicus, was condemned to prison and penance: he found it necessary to recant upon his knees in a solemn manner. A bias acquired from Aristotle, kept reason in chains for centuries. Scholastic divinity in particular, founded on the philosophy of that author, was more hurtful to the reasoning faculty than the Goths and Huns. Tycho Brahé suffered great persecution for maintaining, that the heavens were so far empty of matter as to give free course to the comets; contrary to Aristotle, who taught, that the heavens are harder than a diamond: it was extremely ill taken, that a simple mortal should pretend to give Aristotle the lie. During the infancy of reason, authority is the prevailing argument *.

Reason is extremely apt to be warped by habit. In the disputes among the Athenians, about adjusting the form of their government, it is observable, that those who lived in the high country were for democracy; that the inhabitants of the plains were for oligarchy; and the seamen for monarchy. Shepherds are all equal: in a corn-country, there are a few masters and many servants: on shipboard, there is one commander, and all the rest subjects. Habit was their adviser: none of them thought of consulting reason in order to judge what was the best form upon the whole. Habit of a different kind has an influence no less powerful. Persons who are in the habit of reasoning, require demon-

* Aristotle, it would appear, was less regarded by his contemporaries than by the moderns. Some persons having travelled from Macedon all the way to Persia with complaints against Antipater, Alexander observed, that they would not have made so long a journey had they received no injury. And Cassander, son of Antipater, replying, that their long journey was an argument against them, trusting that witnesses would not be brought from such a distance to give evidence of their calumny; Alexander, smiling, said, "Your argument is one of Aristotle's sophisms, which will serve either side equally."

stration

stration for every thing: even a self-evident proposition is not suffered to escape. These superfluous proofs occur more than once in the Elements of Euclid. Nor has Aristotle, with all his skill in logics, entirely avoided them. Can any thing be more self-evident, than the difference between pleasure and motion? Yet Aristotle attempts to demonstrate, that they are different. "No motion," says he, "except circular motion, is perfect in any one point of time: there is always something wanting during its course, and it is not perfected till it arrive at its end. But pleasure is perfect in every point of time; being the same from the beginning to the end." The difference is clear from perception merely; but is far from being clear from this demonstration. Plato also attempts to demonstrate a self-evident proposition, viz. That a quality is not a body. "Every body," says he, "is a subject: quality is not a subject, but an accident; ergo, quality is not a body. Again, A body cannot be in a subject: every quality is in a subject; ergo, quality is not a body." But Descartes affords the most illustrious instance of the kind. He was the greatest geometer of the age he lived in, and one of the greatest of any age; which insensibly led him to overlook intuitive knowledge, and to admit no proposition but what is demonstrated or proved in the regular form of syllogism. He took a fancy to doubt even of his own existence, till he was convinced of it by the following argument. *Cogito, ergo sum: I think, therefore I exist.* And what sort of a demonstration is this after all? In the very fundamental proposition he acknowledges his existence by the term *I*; and how absurd is it, to imagine a proof necessary of what is admitted to be true in the fundamental proposition? In the next place, How does our author know that he thinks? If nothing is to be taken for granted, an argument is no less necessary to prove that he thinks, than to prove that he exists. It is true, that he has intuitive knowledge of his thinking; but has he not the same of his

his existing? Would not a man deserve to be laughed at, who, after warming himself at a fire, should imagine the following argument necessary to prove its existence, "The fire burns, *ergo* it exists?" Listen to an author of high reputation attempting to demonstrate a self-evident proposition. "The labour of B, cannot be the labour of C; because it is the application of the organs and powers of B, not of C, to the effecting of something; and therefore the labour is as much B's, as the limbs and faculties made use of are his. Again, the effect or produce of the labour of B, is not the effect of the labour of C: and therefore this effect or produce is B's, not C's; as much B's, as the labour was B's, and not C's. Because, what the labour of B causes or produces, B produces by his labour; or it is the product of B by his labour: that is, it is B's product, not C's, or any other's. And if C should pretend to any property in that which B can truly call *his*, he would act contrary to truth (a)."

In every subject of reasoning, to define terms is necessary in order to avoid mistakes. But there must be words that admit not of a definition, otherwise definitions would follow definitions without end: and such words are what signify simple ideas, which have no parts nor composition. The habit however of defining is so inveterate in some men, as to make them attempt to define words signifying simple ideas. Is there any necessity to define motion: do not children understand the meaning of the word? And how is it possible to define it, when there are not words more simple to define it by? Yet Worcester (b) attempts that bold task. "A continual change of place," says he, "or leaving one place for another, without remaining for any space of time in the same place, is called *motion*." That every body

(a) Religion of Nature delineated, sect. 6. paragt. 2.

(b) Natural Philosophy, p. 31.

in motion is continually changing place, is true: but change of place is not motion; it is the effect of motion. Gravefend (a) defines motion thus, "Motus est translatio de loco in locum, five continua loci mutatio *;" which is the same with the former. Yet this very author admits *locus* or *place* to signify a simple idea, incapable of a definition. Is it more simple or more intelligible than motion? But, of all, the most remarkable definition of motion is that of Aristotle, famous for its impenetrability, or rather absurdity, viz. "Actus entis in potentia, quatenus in potentia †."

Extension enters into the conception of every particle of matter; because every particle of matter has length, breadth, and thickness. Figure in the same manner enters into the conception of every particle of matter; because every particle of matter is bounded. By the power of abstraction, figure may be conceived independent of the body that is figured; and extension may be conceived independent of the body that is extended. These particulars are abundantly plain and obvious; and yet observe what a heap of jargon is employ'd by the followers of Leibnitz, in their fruitless endeavours to define extension. In order to that end, they begin with *simple existences*, which they say are unextended, and without parts. According to that definition, simple existences cannot belong to matter, because the smallest particle of matter has both parts and extension. But to let that pass, they endeavour to show as follows, how the idea of extension arises from these simple existences. "We may look upon simple existences, as having mutual

(a) Elements of Physics, p. 28.

* "Motion is, the removing from one place to another, or a continual change of place."

† "The action of a being in power, so far as it is in power."

"relations

“relations with respect to their internal state; relations that form a certain order in their manner of existence. And this order or arrangement of things, coexisting and linked together, but so as we do not distinctly understand how, causes in us a confused idea, from whence arises the appearance of extension.” A Peripatetic philosopher being asked, What sort of things the sensible species of Aristotle are? answered, That they are neither entities nor nonentities, but something intermediate between the two. The famous astronomer Ismael Bulialdus lays down the following proposition, and attempts a mathematical demonstration of it, “That light is a mean-proportional between corporeal substance and incorporeal.”

I close with a curious sort of reasoning, so singular indeed as not to come under any of the foregoing heads. The first editions of the latest version of the Bible into English have a preface, in which the translators make the following apology for not keeping close to the words of the original. “Another thing we think good to admonish thee of, gentle reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could be that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we have translated before, if the word signified the same in both places, (for there be some words that be not of the same sense every where), we were especially careful, and made a conscience according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent*; if one where *journeying*, never *travelling*; if one where *think*, never *suppose*; if one where *pain*, never *ache*; if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, &c.; thus to mince the matter, we thought to favour more

“ of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn
“ in the Atheist, than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the
“ kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we
“ be in bondage to them, if we may be free; use one precisely,
“ when we may use another, no less fit, as commodiously? We
“ might also be charged by scoffers, with some unequal dealing
“ toward a great number of good English words. For as it is
“ written by a certain great philosopher, that he should say, that
“ those logs were happy that were made images to be worship-
“ ped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind
“ the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words,
“ Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to o-
“ thers of like quality, Get ye hence, be banished for ever, we
“ might be taxed peradventure with St James his words, name-
“ ly, to be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts.”
Queritur, Can this translation be safely rely'd on, as the rule of
faith, when such are the translators?

A P P E N D I X.

IN reviewing the foregoing sketch, it occurred, that a fair analysis of Aristotle's logics, would be a valuable addition to the historical branch. A distinct and candid account of a system that for many ages governed the reasoning part of mankind, cannot but be acceptable to the public. Curiosity will be gratified, in seeing a phantom delineated, that so long fascinated the learned world; a phantom, which, like the pyramids of Egypt, or hanging gardens of Babylon, is a structure of infinite genius, but absolutely useless, unless for raising wonder. Dr Reid, professor of moral philosophy in the college of Glasgow, relished the thought; and his friendship to me prevailed on him, after much solicitation, to undertake the laborious task. No man is better acquainted with Aristotle's writings; and, without any enthusiastic attachment, he holds that philosopher to be a first-rate genius.

The logics of Aristotle have been on the decline more than a century; and are at present relegated to schools and colleges. They have occasionally been criticised by different writers; but this is the first attempt to draw them out of their obscurity into day-light. By what follows, one will be enabled to pass a true judgement on them, and to determine, whether they ought, or ought not, to make a branch of education. The Doctor's essay, as a capital article in the progress and history of the sciences, will, I hope, be made welcome, even with the fatigue of squeezing through many thorny paths, before a proper view can be obtained of that ancient and stupendous fabric.

It

It will at the same time show the hurt that Aristotle has done to the reasoning faculty, by drawing it out of its natural course into devious paths. His artificial mode of reasoning, is no less superficial than intricate. I say, superficial; for in none of his logical works, is a single truth attempted to be proved by syllogism that requires a proof: the propositions he undertakes to prove by syllogism, are all of them self-evident. Take for instance the following proposition, That man has a power of self-motion. To prove this, he assumes the following axiom, upon which indeed every one of his syllogisms are founded, viz. That whatever is true of a number of particulars joined together, holds true of every one separately; which is thus expressed in logical terms, Whatever is true of the genus, holds true of every species. Founding upon that axiom, he reasons thus: "All animals have a power of self-motion: man is an animal: *ergo*, man has a power of self-motion." Now if all animals have a power of self-motion, it requires no argument to prove, that man, an animal, has that power: and therefore, what he gives as a conclusion or consequence, is not really so; it is not *inferred* from the fundamental proposition, but is *included* in it. At the same time, the self-motive power of man, is a fact that cannot be known but from experience. I add, that the self-motive power of man, is more clearly ascertained by experience, than that of any other animal: and in attempting to prove man to be a self-motive animal, is it not absurd, to found the argument on a proposition less certain than that undertaken to be demonstrated? What is here observed, will be found applicable to the bulk, if not the whole, of his syllogisms.

It appears singular, that Aristotle himself never attempts to apply his syllogistic mode of reasoning, to any subject handled by him: on ethics, on rhetoric, and on poetry, he argues like a rational being, without once putting in practice any of his own rules.

But

But how is it possible, that a man of his capacity could long remain ignorant, how insufficient a syllogism is for discovering any latent truth? He certainly intended his system of logics, chiefly, if not solely, for disputation; and if such was his purpose, he has been wonderfully successful; for nothing can be better contrived than that system, for wrangling and disputing without end. He indeed in a manner professes this to be his aim, in his books *De Sophisticis elenchis*.

Some ages hence, when the goodly fabric of the Romish spiritual power shall be laid low in the dust, and scarce a vestige remain, it will among antiquaries be a curious enquiry, What was the nature and extent of a tyranny, more oppressive to the minds of men, than the tyranny of ancient Rome was to their persons. During every step of the enquiry, posterity will rejoice over mental liberty, no less precious in their eyes than personal liberty. The despotism of Aristotle with respect to the faculty of reason, was no less complete, than that of the Bishop of Rome with respect to religion; and it has now become a proper subject of curiosity, to enquire into the nature and extent of that despotism, from which men are at last set happily free. One cannot peruse the following sheets, without sympathetic pain for the weakness of man with respect to his noblest faculty; but that pain will redouble his satisfaction, in now being left free to the dictates of reason and common sense.

In my reveries, I have more than once compared Aristotle's logics to a bubble made of soap-water for amusing children; a beautiful figure with splendid colours; fair on the outside, empty within. It has for more than two thousand years been the hard fate of Aristotle's followers, Ixion like, to embrace a cloud for a goddess. — But this is more than sufficient for a preface: and I had almost forgot, that I am detaining my readers from better entertainment, in listening to Dr Reid.

A Brief Account of ARISTOTLE'S LOGIC.

With REMARKS.

C H A P. I.

Of the First Three Treatises.

SECT. I. *Of the Author.*

Aristotle had very uncommon advantages: born in an age when the philosophical spirit in Greece had long flourished, and was in its greatest vigour; brought up in the court of Macedon, where his father was the King's physician; twenty years a favourite scholar of Plato, and tutor to Alexander the Great; who both honoured him with his friendship, and supplied him with every thing necessary for the prosecution of his enquiries.

These advantages he improved by indefatigable study, and immense reading. He was the first we know, says Strabo, who composed a library. And in this the Egyptian and Pergameonian kings, copied his example. As to his genius, it would be disrespectful to mankind, not to allow an uncommon share to a man who governed the opinions of the most enlightened part of the species near two thousand years.

If his talents had been laid out solely for the discovery of truth, and the good of mankind, his laurels would have remained for ever fresh: but he seems to have had a greater passion for fame than

than for truth, and to have wanted rather to be admired as the prince of philosophers, than to be useful: so that it is dubious whether there be in his character most of the philosopher, or of the sophist. The opinion of Lord Bacon is not without probability, That his ambition was as boundless as that of his royal pupil, the one aspiring at universal monarchy over the bodies and fortunes of men, the other over their opinions. If this was the case, it cannot be said, that the philosopher pursued his aim with less industry, less ability, or less success, than the hero.

His writings carry too evident marks of that philosophical pride, vanity, and envy, which have often sullied the character of the learned. He determines boldly things above all human knowledge; and enters upon the most difficult questions, as his pupil entered on a battle, with full assurance of success. He delivers his decisions oracularly, and without any fear of mistake. Rather than confess his ignorance, he hides it under hard words and ambiguous expressions, of which his interpreters can make what pleases them. There is even reason to suspect, that he wrote often with affected obscurity, either that the air of mystery might procure greater veneration, or that his books might be understood only by the adepts who had been initiated in his philosophy.

His conduct towards the writers that went before him has been much censured. After the manner of the Ottoman princes, says Lord Verulam, he thought his throne could not be secure unless he killed all his brethren. Ludovicus Vives charges him with detracting from all philosophers, that he might derive that glory to himself, of which he robbed them. He rarely quotes an author but with a view to censure, and is not very fair in representing the opinions which he censures.

The faults we have mentioned are such as might be expected in a man, who had the daring ambition to be transmitted to all future ages, as the prince of philosophers, as one who had carried

every branch of human knowledge to its utmost limit; and who was not very scrupulous about the means he took to obtain his end.

We ought, however, to do him the justice to observe, that although the pride and vanity of the sophist appear too much in his writings in abstract philosophy, yet in natural history the fidelity of his narrations seems to be equal to his industry; and he always distinguishes between what he knew and what he had by report. And even in abstract philosophy, it would be unfair to impute to Aristotle all the faults, all the obscurities, and all the contradictions that are to be found in his writings. The greatest part, and perhaps the best part, of his writings is lost. There is reason to doubt whether some of those we ascribe to him be really his; and whether what are his be not much vitiated and interpolated. These suspicions are justified by the fate of Aristotle's writings, which is judiciously related, from the best authorities, in Bayle's dictionary, under the article *Tyrannion*, to which I refer.

His books in logic which remain, are, 1. One book of the Categories. 2. One of Interpretation. 3. First Analytics, two books. 4. Last Analytics, two books. 5. Topics, eight books. 6. Of Sophisms, one book. Diogenes Laertius mentions many others that are lost. Those I have mentioned have commonly been published together, under the name of *Aristotle's Organon*, or *his Logic*; and for many ages, Porphyry's Introduction to the Categories has been prefixed to them.

SECT. 2. *Of Porphyry's Introduction.*

In this Introduction, which is addressed to Chrysoarius, the author observes, That in order to understand Aristotle's doctrine concerning the categories, it is necessary to know what a *genus* is,

is, what a *species*, what a *specific difference*, what a *property*, and what an *accident*; that the knowledge of these is also very useful in definition, in division, and even in demonstration: therefore he proposes, in this little tract, to deliver shortly and simply the doctrine of the ancients, and chiefly of the Peripatetics, concerning these five *predicables*; avoiding the more intricate questions concerning them; such as, Whether *genera* and *species* do really exist in nature? or, Whether they are only conceptions of the human mind? If they exist in nature, Whether they are corporeal or incorporeal? and, Whether they are inherent in the objects of sense, or disjoined from them? These, he says, are very difficult questions, and require accurate discussion; but that he is not to meddle with them.

After this preface, he explains very minutely each of the five words above mentioned, divides and subdivides each of them, and then pursues all the agreements and differences between one and another through sixteen chapters.

SECT. 3. *Of the Categories.*

The book begins with an explication of what is meant by univocal words, what by equivocal, and what by denominative. Then it is observed, that what we say is either simple, without composition or structure, as *man*, *horse*; or, it has composition and structure, as, *a man fights*, *the horse runs*. Next comes a distinction between a subject of predication; that is, a subject of which any thing is affirmed or denied, and a subject of inherence. These things are said to be inherent in a subject, which although they are not a part of the subject, cannot possibly exist without it, as figure in the thing figured. Of things that are, says Aristotle, some may be predicated of a subject, but are in no subject; as,

man may be predicated of James or John, but is not in any subject. Some again are in a subject, but can be predicated of no subject. Thus, my knowledge in grammar is in me as its subject, but it can be predicated of no subject; because it is an individual thing. Some are both in a subject, and may be predicated of a subject, as science; which is in the mind as its subject, and may be predicated of geometry. Lastly, Some things can neither be in a subject, nor be predicated of any subject. Such are all individual substances, which cannot be predicated, because they are individuals; and cannot be in a subject, because they are substances. After some other subtilties about predicates and subjects, we come to the categories themselves; the things above mentioned being called by the schoolmen the *antepredicamenta*. It may be observed, however, that notwithstanding the distinction now explained, the *being in a subject*, and the *being predicated truly of a subject*, are in the Analytics used as synonymous phrases; and this variation of style has led some persons to think that the Categories were not wrote by Aristotle.

Things which may be expressed without composition or structure, are, says the author, reducible to the following heads. They are either *substance*, or *quantity*, or *quality*, or *relatives*, or *place*, or *time*, or *having*, or *doing*, or *suffering*. These are the predicaments or categories. The first four are largely treated of in four chapters; the others are slightly passed over, as sufficiently clear of themselves. As a specimen, I shall give a summary of what he says on the category of substance.

Substances are either primary, to wit, individual substances, or secondary, to wit, the genera and species of substances. Primary substances neither are in a subject, nor can be predicated of a subject; but all other things that exist, either are in primary substances, or may be predicated of them. For whatever can be predicated of that which is in a subject, may also be predicated of the subject

subject itself. Primary substances are more substances than the secondary; and of the secondary, the species is more a substance than the genus. If there were no primary, there could be no secondary substances.

The properties of substance are these: 1. No substance is capable of intension or remission. 2. No substance can be in any other thing as its subject of inherence. 3. No substance has a contrary; for one substance cannot be contrary to another; nor can there be contrariety between a substance and that which is no substance. 4. The most remarkable property of substance, is, that one and the same substance may, by some change in itself, become the subject of things that are contrary. Thus, the same body may be at one time hot, at another cold.

Let this serve as a specimen of Aristotle's manner of treating the categories. After them, we have some chapters, which the schoolmen call *postprædicamenta*; wherein, first, the four kinds of opposition of terms are explained; to wit, *relative*, *privative*, of *contrariety*, and of *contradiction*. This is repeated in all systems of logic. Last of all we have distinctions of the four Greek words which answer to the Latin ones, *prius*, *simul*, *motus*, and *habere*.

SECT. 4. *Of the book concerning Interpretation.*

We are to consider, says Aristotle, what a noun is, what a verb, what affirmation, what negation, what speech. Words are the signs of what passeth in the mind; writing is the sign of words. The signs both of writing and of words are different in different nations, but the operations of mind signified by them are the same. There are some operations of thought which are neither true nor false. These are expressed by nouns or verbs singly, and without composition.

A noun is a sound which by compact signifies something without respect to time, and of which no part has signification by itself. The cries of beasts may have a natural signification, but they are not nouns. We give that name only to sounds which have their signification by compact. The cases of a noun, as the genitive, dative, are not nouns. *Non homo* is not a noun, but, for distinction's sake, may be called a *nomen infinitum*.

A verb signifies something by compact with relation to time. Thus, *valet* is a verb; but *valetudo* is a noun, because its signification has no relation to time. It is only the present tense of the indicative that is properly called a verb; the other tenses and moods are variations of the verb. *Non valet* may be called a *verbum infinitum*.

Speech is sound significant by compact, of which some part is also significant. And it is either enunciative, or not enunciative. Enunciative speech is that which affirms or denies. As to speech which is not enunciative, such as a prayer or wish, the consideration of it belongs to oratory, or poetry. Every enunciative speech must have a verb, or some variation of a verb. Affirmation is the enunciation of one thing concerning another. Negation is the enunciation of one thing from another. Contradiction is an affirmation and negation that are opposite. This is a summary of the first six chapters.

The seventh and eighth treat of the various kinds of enunciations or propositions, universal, particular, indefinite, and singular; and of the various kinds of opposition in propositions, and the axioms concerning them. These things are repeated in every system of logic. In the ninth chapter he endeavours to prove, by a long metaphysical reasoning, that propositions respecting future contingencies are not, determinately, either true or false; and that if they were, it would follow, that all things happen necessarily,

family, and could not have been otherwise than as they are. The remaining chapters contain many minute observations concerning the equipollency of propositions both pure and modal.

C H A P. II.

Remarks.

SECT. I. *On the Five Predicables.*

THE writers on logic have borrowed their materials almost entirely from Aristotle's Organon, and Porphyry's Introduction. The Organon however was not wrote by Aristotle as one work. It comprehends various tracts, wrote without the view of making them parts of one whole, and afterwards thrown together by his editors under one name on account of their affinity. Many of his books that are lost would have made a part of the Organon, if they had been saved.

The three treatises of which we have given a brief account, are unconnected with each other, and with those that follow. And although the first was undoubtedly compiled by Porphyry, and the two last probably by Aristotle, yet I consider them as the venerable remains of a philosophy more ancient than Aristotle. Archytas of Tarentum, an eminent mathematician and philosopher of the Pythagorean school, is said to have wrote upon the ten categories. And the five predicables probably had their origin in the same school. Aristotle, tho' abundantly careful to do justice to himself, does not claim the invention of either. And Porphyry, without

without ascribing the latter to Aristotle, professes only to deliver the doctrine of the ancients, and chiefly of the Peripatetics, concerning them.

The writers on logic having divided that science into three parts; the first treating of simple apprehension, and of terms; the second, of judgement, and of propositions; and the third, of reasoning, and of syllogisms. The materials of the first part are taken from Porphyry's Introduction, and the Categories; and those of the second from the book of Interpretation.

A predicable, according to the grammatical form of the word, might seem to signify, whatever may be predicated, that is, affirmed or denied, of some subject. And in this sense every predicate would be a predicable. But the logicians give a different meaning to the word. They divide propositions into certain classes, according to the relation which the predicate of the proposition bears to the subject. The first class is that wherein the predicate is the *genus* of the subject; as when we say, *This is a triangle*, *Jupiter is a planet*. In the second class, the predicate is a *species* of the subject; as when we say, *This triangle is right-angled*. A third class is when the predicate is the specific difference of the subject; as when we say, *Every triangle has three sides and three angles*. A fourth when the predicate is a property of the subject; as when we say, *The angles of every triangle are equal to two right angles*. And a fifth class is when the predicate is something accidental to the subject; as when we say, *This triangle is neatly drawn*.

Each of these classes comprehends a great variety of propositions, having different subjects, and different predicates; but in each class the relation between the predicate and the subject is the same. Now it is to this relation that logicians have given the name of a *predicable*. Hence it is, that altho' the number of predicates be infinite, yet the number of predicables can be no greater than that

that of the different relations which may be in propositions between the predicate and the subject. And if all propositions belong to one or other of the five classes above mentioned, there can be but five predicables, to wit, *genus*, *species*, *differentia*, *proprium*, and *accidens*. These might, with more propriety perhaps, have been called *the five classes of predicates*; but use has determined them to be called *the five predicables*.

It may also be observed, that as some objects of thought are individuals, such as, *Julius Caesar*, *the city Rome*; so others are common to many individuals, as *good*, *great*, *virtuous*, *vicious*. Of this last kind are all things expressed by adjectives. Things common to many individuals were by the ancients called *universals*. All predicates are universals, for they all have the nature of adjectives; and, on the other hand, all universals may be predicates. On this account universals may be divided into the same classes as predicates; and as the five classes of predicates above mentioned have been called the five predicables, so by the same kind of phraseology they have been called *the five universals*; altho' they may more properly be called *the five classes of universals*.

The doctrine of the five universals or predicables makes an essential part of every system of logic, and has been handed down without any change to this day. The very name of *predicables* shews, that the author of this division, whoever he was, intended it as a complete enumeration of all the kinds of things that can be affirmed of any subject; and so it has always been understood.

So that it is implied in this division, that all that can be affirmed of any thing whatsoever, is either the *genus* of the thing, or its *species*, or its *specific difference*, or some *property* or *accident* belonging to it.

Burgesdick, a very acute writer in logic, seems to have been aware, that strong objections might be made to the five predicables, considered as a complete enumeration; but unwilling to al-

low any imperfection in this ancient division, he endeavours to restrain the meaning of the word *predicable*, so as to obviate objections. Those things only, says he, are to be accounted predicables, which may be affirmed of *many individuals, truly, properly, and immediately*. The consequence of putting such limitations upon the word *predicable* is, that in many propositions, perhaps in most, the predicate is not a predicable. But admitting all his limitations, the enumeration will still be very incomplete: for of many things we may affirm truly, properly, and immediately, their existence, their end, their cause, their effect, and various relations which they bear to other things. These, and perhaps many more, are predicables in the strict sense of the word, no less than the five which have been so long famous.

Altho' Porphyry, and all subsequent writers, make the predicables to be, in number, five; yet Aristotle himself, in the beginning of the Topics, reduces them to four; and demonstrates, that they can be no more. We shall give his demonstration when we come to the Topics; and shall only here observe, that as Burgerfick justifies the fivefold division, by restraining the meaning of the word *predicable*; so Aristotle justifies the fourfold division, by enlarging the meaning of the words *property* and *accident*.

After all, I apprehend, that this ancient division of predicables, with all its imperfections, will bear a comparison with those which have been substituted in its stead by the most celebrated modern philosophers.

Locke, in his Essay on the Human Understanding, having laid it down as a principle, That all our knowledge consists in perceiving certain agreements and disagreements between our ideas, reduces these agreements and disagreements to four heads: to wit, 1. Identity and Diversity; 2. Relation; 3. Coexistence; 4. Real Existence (a). Here are four predicables given as a complete e-

(a) Book 4. chap. 1.

numeration,

numeration, and yet not one of the ancient predicables is included in the number.

The author of the *Treatise of Human Nature*, proceeding upon the same principle, That all our knowledge is only a perception of the relations of our ideas, observes, "That it may perhaps be
"esteemed an endless task, to enumerate all those qualities which
"admit of comparison, and by which the ideas of philosophical
"relation are produced: but if we diligently consider them, we
"shall find, that without difficulty they may be comprised under
"seven general heads: 1. Resemblance; 2. Identity; 3. Relations of Space and Time; 4. Relations of Quantity and Number; 5. Degrees of Quality; 6. Contrariety; 7. Causation (a)." Here again are seven predicables given as a complete enumeration, wherein all the predicables of the ancients, as well as two of Locke's, are left out.

The ancients in their division attended only to categorical propositions which have one subject and one predicate; and of these, only to such as have a general term for their subject. The moderns, by their definition of knowledge, have been led to attend only to relative propositions, which express a relation between two subjects, and those subjects they suppose to be always ideas.

SECT. 2. *On the Ten Categories, and on Divisions in general.*

The intention of the categories or predicaments is, to muster every object of human apprehension under ten heads: for the categories are given as a complete enumeration of every thing which can be expressed without *composition* and *structure*; that is,

(a) Vol. 1. p. 33. and 125.

of every thing which can be either the subject or the predicate of a proposition. So that as every foldier belongs to some company, and every company to some regiment; in like manner every thing that can be the object of human thought, has its place in one or other of the ten categories; and by dividing and subdividing properly the several categories, all the notions that enter into the human mind may be mustered in rank and file, like an army in the day of battle.

The perfection of the division of categories into ten heads, has been strenuously defended by the followers of Aristotle, as well as that of the five predicables. They are indeed of kin to each other. They breathe the same spirit, and probably had the same origin. By the one we are taught to marshal every term that can enter into a proposition, either as subject or predicate; and by the other, we are taught all the possible relations which the subject can have to the predicate. Thus, the whole furniture of the human mind is presented to us at one view, and contracted, as it were, into a nut-shell. To attempt, in so early a period, a methodical delineation of the vast region of human knowledge, actual and possible, and to point out the limits of every district, was indeed magnanimous in a high degree, and deserves our admiration, while we lament that the human powers are unequal to so bold a flight.

A regular distribution of things under proper classes or heads, is, without doubt, a great help both to memory and judgement. And as the philosopher's province includes all things human and divine that can be objects of enquiry, he is naturally led to attempt some general division, like that of the categories. And the invention of a division of this kind, which the speculative part of mankind acquiesced in for two thousand years, marks a superiority of genius in the inventor, whoever he was. Nor does it appear, that the general divisions which, since the decline of the Peripatetic

tic philosophy, have been substituted in place of the ten categories, are more perfect.

Locke has reduced all things to three categories; to wit, substances, modes, and relations. In this division, time, space, and number, three great objects of human thought, are omitted.

The author of the Treatise of Human Nature has reduced all things to two categories; to wit, ideas, and impressions: a division which is very well adapted to his system; and which puts me in mind of another made by an excellent mathematician in a printed thesis I have seen. In it the author, after a severe censure of the ten categories of the Peripatetics, maintains, that there neither are nor can be more than two categories of things; to wit, *data*, and *quæsitæ*.

There are two ends that may be proposed by such divisions. The first is, to methodize or digest in order what a man actually knows. This is neither unimportant nor impracticable; and in proportion to the solidity and accuracy of a man's judgement, his divisions of things which he knows, will be elegant and useful. The same subject may admit, and even require, various divisions, according to the different points of view from which we contemplate it: nor does it follow, that because one division is good, therefore another is naught. To be acquainted with the divisions of the logicians and metaphysicians, without a superstitious attachment to them, may be of use in dividing the same subjects, or even those of a different nature. Thus, Quintilian borrows from the ten categories his division of the topics of rhetorical argumentation. Of all methods of arrangement, the most antiphi-losophical seems to be the invention of this age; I mean, the arranging the arts and sciences by the letters of the alphabet, in dictionaries and encyclopedies. With these authors the categories are, A, B, C, &c.

Another end commonly proposed by such divisions, but very rarely

rarely attained, is, to exhaust the subject divided; so that nothing that belongs to it shall be omitted. It is one of the general rules of division in all systems of logic, That the division should be adequate to the subject divided: a good rule, without doubt; but very often beyond the reach of human power. To make a perfect division, a man must have a perfect comprehension of the whole subject at one view. When our knowledge of the subject is imperfect, any division we can make of it, must be like the first sketch of a painter, to be extended, contracted, or mended, as the subject shall be found to require. Yet nothing is more common, not only among the ancient, but even among modern philosophers, than to draw, from their incomplete divisions, conclusions which suppose them to be perfect.

A division is a repository which the philosopher frames for holding his ware in convenient order. The philosopher maintains, that such or such a thing is not good ware, because there is no place in his ware-room that fits it. We are apt to yield to this argument in philosophy, but it would appear ridiculous in any other traffic.

Peter Ramus, who had the spirit of a reformer in philosophy, and who had a force of genius sufficient to shake the Aristotelian fabric in many parts, but insufficient to erect any thing more solid in its place, tried to remedy the imperfection of philosophical divisions, by introducing a new manner of dividing. His divisions always consisted of two members, one of which was contradictory of the other; as if one should divide England into Middlesex and what is not Middlesex. It is evident that these two members comprehend all England: for the logicians observe, that a term, along with its contradictory, comprehend all things. In the same manner, we may divide what is not Middlesex into Kent and what is not Kent. Thus one may go on by divisions and subdivisions that are absolutely complete. This example may
serve

serve to give an idea of the spirit of Ramean divisions, which were in no small reputation about two hundred years ago.

Aristotle was not ignorant of this kind of division. But he used it only as a touchstone to prove by induction the perfection of some other division, which indeed is the best use that can be made of it; when applied to the common purpose of division, it is both inelegant, and burdensome to the memory; and, after it has put one out of breath by endless subdivisions, there is still a negative term left behind, which shows that you are no nearer the end of your journey than when you began.

Until some more effectual remedy be found for the imperfection of divisions, I beg leave to propose one more simple than that of Ramus. It is this: When you meet with a division of any subject imperfectly comprehended, add to the last member an *et cetera*. That this *et cetera* makes the division complete, is undeniable; and therefore it ought to hold its place as a member, and to be always understood, whether expressed or not, until clear and positive proof be brought, that the division is complete without it. And this same *et cetera* shall be the repository of all members that shall in any future time shew a good and valid right to a property in the subject.

SECT. 3. On Distinctions.

Having said so much of logical divisions, we shall next make some remarks upon distinctions.

Since the philosophy of Aristotle fell into disrepute, it has been a common topic of wit and raillery, to enveigh against metaphysical distinctions. Indeed the abuse of them in the scholastic ages, seems to justify a general prejudice against them; and shallow thinkers and writers have good reason to be jealous of distinctions,

tinctions, because they make sad work when applied to their flimsy compositions. But every man of true judgement, while he condemns distinctions that have no foundation in the nature of things, must perceive, that indiscriminately to decry distinctions, is, to renounce all pretensions to just reasoning: for as false reasoning commonly proceeds from confounding things that are different, so without distinguishing such things, it is impossible to avoid error, or detect sophistry. The authority of Aquinas, or Suarez, or even of Aristotle, can neither stamp a real value upon distinctions of base metal, nor ought it to hinder the currency of those that have intrinsic value.

Some distinctions are verbal, others are real. The first kind distinguish the various meanings of a word; some of which may be proper, others metaphorical. Distinctions of this kind make a part of the grammar of a language, and are often absurd when translated into another language. Real distinctions are equally good in all languages, and suffer no hurt by translation. They distinguish the different species contained under some general notion, or the different parts contained in one whole.

Many of Aristotle's distinctions are verbal merely; and therefore more proper materials for a dictionary of the Greek language than for a philosophical treatise. At least, they ought never to have been translated into other languages, when the idiom of the language will not justify them: for this is to adulterate the language, to introduce foreign idioms into it without necessity or use, and to make it ambiguous where it was not. The distinctions in the end of the Categories of the four words *prius*, *simul*, *motus*, and *habere*, are all verbal.

The modes or species of *prius*, according to Aristotle, are five. One thing may be prior to another; first, in point of time; secondly, in point of dignity; thirdly, in point of order; and so forth. The modes of *simul* are only three. It seems this word was

not

not used in the Greek with so great latitude as the other, although they are relative terms.

The modes or species of motion he makes to be six, to wit, generation, corruption, increase, decrease, alteration, and change of place.

The modes or species of *having* are eight. 1. Having a quality or habit, as having wisdom. 2. Having quantity or magnitude. 3. Having things adjacent, as having a sword. 4. Having things as parts, as having hands or feet. 5. Having in a part or on a part, as having a ring on one's finger. 6. Containing, as a cask is said to have wine. 7. Possessing, as having lands or houses. 8. Having a wife.

Another distinction of this kind is Aristotle's distinction of causes; of which he makes four kinds, efficient, material, formal, and final. These distinctions may deserve a place in a dictionary of the Greek language; but in English or Latin they adulterate the language. Yet so fond were the schoolmen of distinctions of this kind, that they added to Aristotle's enumeration, an impulsive cause, an exemplary cause, and I don't know how many more. We seem to have adopted into English a final cause; but it is merely a term of art, borrowed from the Peripatetic philosophy, without necessity or use: for the English word *end* is as good as *final cause*, though not so long nor so learned.

SECT. 4. On Definitions.

It remains that we make some remarks on Aristotle's definitions, which have exposed him to much censure and ridicule. Yet I think it must be allowed, that in things which need definition, and admit of it, his definitions are commonly judicious and accurate; and had he attempted to define such things only, his ene-

mies had wanted great matter of triumph. I believe it may likewise be said in his favour, that until Locke's essay was wrote, there was nothing of importance delivered by philosophers with regard to definition, beyond what Aristotle has said upon that subject.

He considers a definition as a speech declaring what a thing is. Every thing essential to the thing defined, and nothing more, must be contained in the definition. Now the essence of a thing consists of these two parts: First, What is common to it with other things of the same kind; and, secondly, What distinguishes it from other things of the same kind. The first is called the *genus* of the thing, the second its *specific difference*. The definition therefore consists of these two parts. And for finding them, we must have recourse to the ten categories; in one or other of which every thing in nature is to be found. Each category is a *genus*, and is divided into so many species, which are distinguished by their specific differences. Each of these species is again subdivided into so many species, with regard to which it is a *genus*. This division and subdivision continues until we come to the lowest species, which can only be divided into individuals, distinguished from one another, not by any specific difference, but by accidental differences of time, place, and other circumstances.

The category itself being the highest genus, is in no respect a species, and the lowest species is in no respect a *genus*; but every intermediate order is a genus compared with those that are below it, and a species compared with those above it. To find the definition of any thing, therefore, you must take the genus which is immediately above its place in the category, and the specific difference, by which it is distinguished from other species of the same genus. These two make a perfect definition. This I take to be the substance of Aristotle's system; and probably the system of the Pythagorean school before Aristotle, concerning definition.

But

But notwithstanding the specious appearance of this system, it has its defects. Not to repeat what was before said, of the imperfection of the division of things into ten categories, the subdivisions of each category are no less imperfect. Aristotle has given some subdivisions of a few of them; and as far as he goes, his followers pretty unanimously take the same road. But when they attempt to go farther, they take very different roads. It is evident, that if the series of each category could be completed, and the division of things into categories could be made perfect, still the highest genus in each category could not be defined, because it is not a species; nor could individuals be defined, because they have no specific difference. There are also many species of things, whose specific difference cannot be expressed in language, even when it is evident to sense, or to the understanding. Thus, green, red, and blue, are very distinct species of colour; but who can express in words wherein green differs from red or blue?

Without borrowing light from the ancient system, we may perceive, that every definition must consist of words that need no definition; and that to define the common words of a language that have no ambiguity, is trifling, if it could be done; the only use of a definition being to give a clear and adequate conception of the meaning of a word.

The logicians indeed distinguish between the definition of a word, and the definition of a thing; considering the former as the mean office of a lexicographer, but the last as the grand work of a philosopher. But what they have said about the definition of a thing, if it has a meaning, is beyond my comprehension. All the rules of definition agree to the definition of a word; and if they mean by the definition of a thing, the giving an adequate conception of the nature and essence of any thing that exists; this is impossible, and is the vain boast of men unconscious of the weakness of human understanding.

The works of God are all imperfectly known by us. We see their outside, or perhaps we discover some of their qualities and relations, by observation and experiment, assisted by reasoning; but we can give no definition of the meanest of them which comprehends its real essence. It is justly observed by Locke, that nominal essences only, which are the creatures of our own minds, are perfectly comprehended by us, or can be properly defined; and even of these there are many too simple in their nature to admit of definition. When we cannot give precision to our notions by a definition, we must endeavour to do it by attentive reflection upon them, by observing minutely their agreements and differences, and especially by a right understanding of the powers of our own minds by which such notions are formed.

The principles laid down by Locke with regard to definition, and with regard to the abuse of words, carry conviction along with them; and I take them to be one of the most important improvements made in logic since the days of Aristotle; not so much because they enlarge our knowledge, as because they make us sensible of our ignorance, and shew that a great part of what speculative men have admired as profound philosophy, is only a darkening of knowledge by words without understanding.

If Aristotle had understood those principles, many of his definitions, which furnish matter of triumph to his enemies, had never seen the light: let us impute them to the times rather than to the man. The sublime Plato, it is said, thought it necessary to have the definition of a man, and could find none better than *Animal implume bipes*; upon which Diogenes sent to his school a cock with his feathers plucked off, desiring to know whether it was a man or not.

The few hints contained in the beginning of the book concerning Interpretation, relating to the structure of speech, have been left out in treatises of logic, as belonging rather to grammar; yet I apprehend this is a rich field of philosophical speculation. Language being the express image of human thought, the analysis of the one must correspond to that of the other. Nouns adjective and substantive, verbs active and passive, with their various moods, tenses, and persons, must be expressive of a like variety in the modes of thought. Things which are distinguished in all languages, such as substance and quality, action and passion, cause and effect, must be distinguished by the natural powers of the human mind. The philosophy of grammar, and that of the human understanding, are more nearly allied than is commonly imagined.

The structure of language was pursued to a considerable extent, by the ancient commentators upon this book of Aristotle. Their speculations upon this subject, which are neither the least ingenious nor the least useful part of the Peripatetic philosophy, were neglected for many ages, and lay buried in ancient manuscripts, or in books little known, till they were lately brought to light by the learned Mr Harris in his *Hermes*.

The definitions given by Aristotle, of a noun, of a verb, and of speech, will hardly bear examination. It is easy in practice to distinguish the various parts of speech; but very difficult, if at all possible, to give accurate definitions of them.

He observes justly, that besides that kind of speech called a *proposition*, which is always either true or false, there are other kinds which are neither true nor false; such as, a prayer, or wish; to

which

which we may add, a question, a command, a promise, a contract, and many others. These Aristotle pronounces to have nothing to do with his subject, and remits them to oratory, or poetry; and so they have remained banished from the regions of philosophy to this day: yet I apprehend, that an analysis of such speeches, and of the operations of mind which they express, would be of real use, and perhaps would discover how imperfect an enumeration the logicians have given of the powers of human understanding, when they reduce them to simple apprehension, judgement, and reasoning.

SECT. 6. *On Propositions.*

Mathematicians use the word *proposition* in a larger sense than logicians. A problem is called a *proposition* in mathematics, but in logic it is not a proposition: it is one of those speeches which are not enunciative, and which Aristotle remits to oratory or poetry.

A proposition, according to Aristotle, is a speech wherein one thing is affirmed or denied of another. Hence it is easy to distinguish the thing affirmed or denied, which is called *the predicate*, from the thing of which it is affirmed or denied, which is called *the subject*; and these two are called *the terms of the proposition*. Hence likewise it appears, that propositions are either affirmative or negative; and this is called *their quality*. All affirmative propositions have the same quality, so likewise have all the negative; but an affirmative and a negative are contrary in their quality.

When the subject of a proposition is a general term, the predicate is affirmed or denied, either of the whole, or of a part. Hence propositions are distinguished into universal and particular. *All men are mortal*, is an universal proposition; *Some men are learn-*

ed,

ed, is a particular, and this is called *the quantity of the proposition*. All universal propositions agree in quantity, as also all particular: while an universal and a particular are said to differ in quantity. A proposition is called *indefinite*, when there is no mark either of universality or particularity annexed to the subject: thus, *Man is of few days*, is an indefinite proposition; but it must be understood either as universal or as particular, and therefore is not a third species, but by interpretation is brought under one of the other two.

There are also singular propositions, which have not a general term but an individual for their subject; as, *Alexander was a great conqueror*. These are considered by logicians as universal, because, the subject being indivisible, the predicate is affirmed or denied of the whole, and not of a part only. Thus all propositions, with regard to quality, are either affirmative or negative; and with regard to quantity, are universal or particular; and taking in both quantity and quality, they are universal affirmatives, or universal negatives, or particular affirmatives, or particular negatives. These four kinds, after the days of Aristotle, came to be named by the names of the four first vowels, A, E, I, O, according to the following distich:

Afferit A, negat E, sed universaliter ambe;

Afferit I, negat O, sed particulariter ambo.

When the young logician is thus far instructed in the nature of propositions, he is apt to think there is no difficulty in analysing any proposition, and shewing its subject and predicate, its quantity and quality; and indeed, unless he can do this, he will be unable to apply the rules of logic to use. Yet he will find, there are some difficulties in this analysis, which are overlooked by Aristotle altogether; and altho' they are sometimes touched, they are not removed

removed by his followers. For, 1. There are propositions in which it is difficult to find a subject and a predicate; as in these, *It rains, It snows.* 2. In some propositions either term may be made the subject or the predicate as you like best; as in this, *Virtue is the road to happiness.* 3. The same example may serve to shew, that it is sometimes difficult to say, whether a proposition be universal or particular. 4. The quality of some propositions is so dubious, that logicians have never been able to agree whether they be affirmative or negative; as in this proposition, *Whatever is insentient is not an animal.* 5. As there is one class of propositions which have only two terms, to wit, one subject and one predicate, which are called *categorical propositions*; so there are many classes that have more than two terms. What Aristotle delivers in this book is applicable only to categorical propositions; and to them only the rules concerning the conversion of propositions, and concerning the figures and modes of syllogisms, are accommodated. The subsequent writers of logic have taken notice of some of the many classes of complex propositions, and have given rules adapted to them; but finding this work endless, they have left us to manage the rest by the rules of common sense.

C H A P.

C H A P. III.

Account of the First Analytics.

SECT. I. *Of the Conversion of Propositions.*

IN attempting to give some account of the Analytics and of the Topics of Aristotle, ingenuity requires me to confess, that tho' I have often purposed to read the whole with care, and to understand what is intelligible, yet my courage and patience always failed before I had done. Why should I throw away so much time and painful attention upon a thing of so little real use? If I had lived in those ages when the knowledge of Aristotle's Organon intitled a man to the highest rank in philosophy, ambition might have induced me to employ upon it some years painful study; and less, I conceive, would not be sufficient. Such reflections as these, always got the better of my resolution, when the first ardor began to cool. All I can say is, that I have read some parts of the different books with care, some slightly, and some perhaps not at all. I have glanced over the whole often, and when any thing attracted my attention, have dipped into it till my appetite was satisfied. Of all reading it is the most dry and the most painful, employing an infinite labour of demonstration, about things of the most abstract nature, delivered in a laconic style, and often, I think, with affected obscurity; and all to prove general propositions, which when applied to particular instances appear self-evident.

There is probably but little in the Categories, or in the book of Interpretation, which Aristotle could claim as his own invention: but the whole theory of syllogisms he claims as his own, and as the fruit of much time and labour. And indeed it is a stately fabrick, a monument of a great genius, which we could wish to have been more usefully employed. There must be something however adapted to please the human understanding, or to flatter human pride, in a work which occupied men of speculation for more than a thousand years. These books are called *Analytics*, because the intention of them is to resolve all reasoning into its simple ingredients.

The first book of the First Analytics, consisting of forty-six chapters, may be divided into four parts; the first treating of the conversion of propositions; the second, of the structure of syllogisms in all the different figures and modes; the third, of the invention of a middle term; and the last, of the resolution of syllogisms. We shall give a brief account of each.

To convert a proposition, is to infer from it another proposition, whose subject is the predicate of the first, and whose predicate is the subject of the first. This is reduced by Aristotle to three rules. 1. An universal negative may be converted into an universal negative: thus, *No man is a quadruped*; therefore, *No quadruped is a man*. 2. An universal affirmative can be converted only into a particular affirmative: thus, *All men are mortal*; therefore, *Some mortal beings are men*. 3. A particular affirmative may be converted into a particular affirmative: as, *Some men are just*; therefore, *Some just persons are men*. When a proposition may be converted without changing its quantity, this is called *simple conversion*; but when the quantity is diminished, as in the universal affirmative, it is called conversion *per accidens*.

There is another kind of conversion, omitted in this place by Aristotle, but supplied by his followers, called *conversion by contraposition*,

position, in which the term which is contradictory to the predicate is put for the subject, and the quality of the proposition is changed; as, *All animals are sentient*; therefore, *What is insentient is not an animal*. A fourth rule of conversion therefore is, That an universal affirmative, and a particular negative, may be converted by contraposition.

SECT. 2. *Of the Figures and Modes of pure Syllogisms.*

A syllogism is an argument, or reasoning, consisting of three propositions, the last of which, called *the conclusion*, is inferred from the two preceding, which are called *the premises*. The conclusion having two terms, a subject and a predicate, its predicate is called the *major term*, and its subject the *minor term*. In order to prove the conclusion, each of its terms is in the premises compared with a third term, called the *middle term*. By this means one of the premises will have for its two terms the major term and the middle term; and this premise is called the *major premise*, or the *major proposition* of the syllogism. The other premise must have for its two terms the minor term and the middle term, and it is called the *minor proposition*. Thus the syllogism consists of three propositions, distinguished by the names of the *major*, the *minor*, and the *conclusion*: and altho' each of these has two terms, a subject and a predicate, yet there are only three different terms in all. The major term is always the predicate of the conclusion, and is also either the subject or predicate of the major proposition. The minor term is always the subject of the conclusion, and is also either the subject or predicate of the minor proposition. The middle term never enters into the conclusion, but stands in both premises, either in the position of subject or of predicate.

According to the various positions which the middle term may

have in the premises, fyllogifms are said to be of various figures. Now all the possible positions of the middle term are only four: for, first, it may be the subject of the major proposition, and the predicate of the minor, and then the fyllogifm is of the first figure; or it may be the predicate of both premises, and then the fyllogifm is of the second figure; or it may be the subject of both, which makes a fyllogifm of the third figure; or it may be the predicate of the major proposition, and the subject of the minor, which makes the fourth figure. Aristotle takes no notice of the fourth figure. It was added by the famous Galen, and is often called *the Galenical figure*.

There is another division of fyllogifms according to their modes. The mode of a fyllogifm is determined by the quality and quantity of the propositions of which it consists. Each of the three propositions must be either an universal affirmative, or an universal negative, or a particular affirmative, or a particular negative. These four kinds of propositions, as was before observed, have been named by the four vowels, A, E, I, O; by which means the mode of a fyllogifm is marked by any three of those four vowels. Thus A, A, A, denotes that mode in which the major, minor, and conclusion, are all universal affirmatives; E, A, E, denotes that mode in which the major and conclusion are universal negatives, and the minor is an universal affirmative.

To know all the possible modes of fyllogifm, we must find how many different combinations may be made of three out of the four vowels, and from the art of combination the number is found to be sixty-four. So many possible modes there are in every figure, consequently in the three figures of Aristotle there are one hundred and ninety-two, and in all the four figures two hundred and fifty-six.

Now the theory of fyllogifm requires, that we shew what are the particular modes in each figure, which do, or do not, form a just

just and conclusive syllogism, that so the legitimate may be adopted, and the spurious rejected. This Aristotle has shewn in the first three figures, examining all the modes one by one, and passing sentence upon each; and from this examination he collects some rules which may aid the memory in distinguishing the false from the true, and point out the properties of each figure.

The first figure has only four legitimate modes. The major proposition in this figure must be universal, and the minor affirmative; and it has this property, that it yields conclusions of all kinds, affirmative and negative, universal and particular.

The second figure has also four legitimate modes. Its major proposition must be universal, and one of the premises must be negative. It yields conclusions both universal and particular, but all negative.

The third figure has six legitimate modes. Its minor must always be affirmative; and it yields conclusions both affirmative and negative, but all particular.

Besides the rules that are proper to each figure, Aristotle has given some that are common to all, by which the legitimacy of syllogisms may be tried. These may, I think, be reduced to five.

1. There must be only three terms in a syllogism. As each term occurs in two of the propositions, it must be precisely the same in both: if it be not, the syllogism is said to have four terms, which makes a vitious syllogism.
2. The middle term must be taken universally in one of the premises.
3. Both premises must not be particular propositions, nor both negative.
4. The conclusion must be particular, if either of the premises be particular; and negative, if either of the premises be negative.
5. No term can be taken universally in the conclusion, if it be not taken universally in the premises.

For understanding the second and fifth of these rules, it is necessary to observe, that a term is said to be taken universally, not only

only when it is the subject of an universal proposition, but when it is the predicate of a negative proposition; on the other hand, a term is said to be taken particularly, when it is either the subject of a particular, or the predicate of an affirmative proposition.

SECT. 3. *Of the Invention of a Middle Term.*

The third part of this book contains rules general and special for the invention of a middle term; and this the author conceives to be of great utility. The general rules amount to this, That you are to consider well both terms of the proposition to be proved; their definition, their properties, the things which may be affirmed or denied of them, and those of which they may be affirmed or denied: those things collected together, are the materials from which your middle term is to be taken.

The special rules require you to consider the quantity and quality of the proposition to be proved, that you may discover in what mode and figure of syllogism the proof is to proceed. Then from the materials before collected, you must seek a middle term which has that relation to the subject and predicate of the proposition to be proved, which the nature of the syllogism requires. Thus, suppose the proposition I would prove is an universal affirmative, I know by the rules of syllogisms, that there is only one legitimate mode in which an universal affirmative proposition can be proved; and that is the first mode of the first figure. I know likewise, that in this mode both the premises must be universal affirmatives; and that the middle term must be the subject of the major, and the predicate of the minor. Therefore of the terms collected according to the general rule, I seek out one or more which have these two properties; first, That the predicate of the proposition to be proved can be universally affirmed of it; and, secondly,

secondly, That it can be universally affirmed of the subject of the proposition to be proved. Every term you can find which has those two properties, will serve you as a middle term, but no other. In this way, the author gives special rules for all the various kinds of propositions to be proved; points out the various modes in which they may be proved, and the properties which the middle term must have to make it fit for answering that end. And the rules are illustrated, or rather, in my opinion, purposely darkened, by putting letters of the alphabet for the several terms.

SECT. 4. *Of the remaining part of the First Book.*

The resolution of syllogisms requires no other principles but those before laid down for constructing them. However it is treated of largely, and rules laid down for reducing reasoning to syllogisms, by supplying one of the premises when it is understood, by rectifying inversions, and putting the propositions in the proper order.

Here he speaks also of hypothetical syllogisms; which, he acknowledges, cannot be resolved into any of the figures, although there be many kinds of them which ought diligently to be observed; and which he promises to handle afterwards. But this promise is not fulfilled, as far as I know, in any of his works that are extant.

SECT. 5. *Of the Second Book of the First Analytics.*

The second book treats of the powers of syllogisms, and shows, in twenty-seven chapters, how we may perform many feats by them,

them, and what figures and modes are adapted to each. Thus, in some fyllogisms several distinct conclusions may be drawn from the same premises: in some, true conclusions may be drawn from false premises: in some, by assuming the conclusion and one premise, you may prove the other; you may turn a direct fyllogism into one leading to an absurdity.

We have likewise precepts given in this book, both to the assailant in a fyllogistical dispute, how to carry on his attack with art, so as to obtain the victory; and to the defendant, how to keep the enemy at such a distance as that he shall never be obliged to yield. From which we learn, that Aristotle introduced in his own school, the practice of disputing fyllogistically, instead of the rhetorical disputations which the sophists were wont to use in more ancient times.

C H A P. IV.

Remarks.

SECT. I. *Of the Conversion of Propositions.*

WE have given a summary view of the theory of pure fyllogisms as delivered by Aristotle, a theory of which he claims the sole invention. And I believe it will be difficult, in any science, to find so large a system of truths of so very abstract and so general a nature, all fortified by demonstration, and all invented and perfected by one man. It shows a force of genius, and labour of investigation,

investigation, equal to the most arduous attempts. I shall now make some remarks upon it.

As to the conversion of propositions, the writers on logic commonly satisfy themselves with illustrating each of the rules by an example, conceiving them to be self-evident when applied to particular cases. But Aristotle has given demonstrations of the rules he mentions. As a specimen, I shall give his demonstration of the first rule. "Let A B be an universal negative proposition; I say, that if A is in no B, it will follow that B is in no A. If you deny this consequence, let B be in some A, for example, in C; then the first supposition will not be true; for C is of the 'B's.' In this demonstration, if I understand it, the third rule of conversion is assumed, that if B is in some A, then A must be in some B, which indeed is contrary to the first supposition. If the third rule be assumed for proof of the first, the proof of all the three goes round in a circle; for the second and third rules are proved by the first. This is a fault in reasoning which Aristotle condemns, and which I would be very unwilling to charge him with, if I could find any better meaning in his demonstration. But it is indeed a fault very difficult to be avoided, when men attempt to prove things that are self-evident.

The rules of conversion cannot be applied to all propositions, but only to those that are categorical; and we are left to the direction of common sense in the conversion of other propositions. To give an example: Alexander was the son of Philip; therefore Philip was the father of Alexander: A is greater than B; therefore B is less than A. These are conversions which, as far as I know, do not fall within any rule in logic; nor do we find any loss for want of a rule in such cases.

Even in the conversion of categorical propositions, it is not enough to transpose the subject and predicate. Both must undergo some change, in order to fit them for their new station: for in e-

very proposition the subject must be a substantive, or have the force of a substantive; and the predicate must be an adjective, or have the force of an adjective. Hence it follows, that when the subject is an individual, the proposition admits not of conversion. How, for instance, shall we convert this proposition, God is omniscient?

These observations show, that the doctrine of the conversion of propositions is not so complete as it appears. The rules are laid down without any limitation; yet they are fitted only to one class of propositions, to wit, the categorical; and of these only to such as have a general term for their subject.

SECT. 2. *On Additions made to Aristotle's Theory.*

Although the logicians have enlarged the first and second parts of logic, by explaining some technical words and distinctions which Aristotle had omitted, and by giving names to some kinds of propositions which he overlooks; yet in what concerns the theory of categorical syllogisms, he is more full, more minute and particular, than any of them: so that they seem to have thought this capital part of the Organon rather redundant than deficient.

It is true, that Galen added a fourth figure to the three mentioned by Aristotle. But there is reason to think that Aristotle omitted the fourth figure, not through ignorance or inattention, but of design, as containing only some indirect modes, which, when properly expressed, fall into the first figure.

It is true also, that Peter Ramus, a professed enemy of Aristotle, introduced some new modes that are adapted to singular propositions; and that Aristotle takes no notice of singular propositions, either in his rules of conversion, or in the modes of syllogism. But the friends of Aristotle have shewn, that this improvement of

of Ramus is more specious than useful. Singular propositions have the force of universal propositions, and are subject to the same rules. The definition given by Aristotle of an universal proposition applies to them; and therefore he might think, that there was no occasion to multiply the modes of syllogism upon their account.

These attempts, therefore, show rather inclination than power, to discover any material defect in Aristotle's theory.

The most valuable addition made to the theory of categorical syllogisms, seems to be the invention of those technical names given to the legitimate modes, by which they may be easily remembered, and which have been comprised in these barbarous verses.

Barbara, Celarent, Darii, Ferio, dato primæ;

Cesare, Camestres, Festino, Baroco, secundæ;

Tertia grande sonans recitat Darapti, Felapton;

Adjungens Disamis, Datisi, Bocardo, Ferison.

In these verses, every legitimate mode belonging to the three figures has a name given to it, by which it may be distinguished and remembered. And this name is so contrived as to denote its nature: for the name has three vowels, which denote the kind of each of its propositions.

Thus, a syllogism in *Bocardo* must be made up of the propositions denoted by the three vowels, O, A, O; that is, its major and conclusion must be particular negative propositions, and its minor an universal affirmative; and being in the third figure, the middle term must be the subject of both premises.

This is the mystery contained in the vowels of those barbarous words. But there are other mysteries contained in their consonants: for, by their means, a child may be taught to reduce any

fylogifm of the fecond or third figure to one of the firft. So that the four modes of the firft figure being directly proved to be conclusive, all the modes of the other two are proved at the fame time, by means of this operation of reduction. For the rules and manner of this reduction, and the different fpecies of it, called *offenfive* and *per impoffibile*, I refer to the logicians, that I may not difclofe all their mysteries.

The invention contained in thefe verfes is fo ingenious, and fo great an adminicle to the dextrous management of fylogifms, that I think it very probable that Aristotle had fome contrivance of this kind, which was kept as one of the fecret doctrines of his fchool, and handed down by tradition, until fome body brought it to light. This is offered only as a conjecture, leaving it to thofe who are better acquainted with the moft ancient commentators on the Analytics, either to refute or to confirm it.

SECT. 3. *On Examples ufed to illuftrate this Theory.*

We may obferve, that Aristotle hardly ever gives examples of real fylogifms to illuftrate his rules. In demonstrating the legitimate modes, he takes A, B, C, for the terms of the fylogifm. Thus, the firft mode of the firft figure is demonstrated by him in this manner. "For," fays he, "if A is attributed to every B, and B to every C, it follows neceffarily, that A may be attributed to every C." For difproving the illegitimate modes, he ufes the fame manner; with this difference, that he commonly for an example gives three real terms, fuch as, *bonum*, *habitus*, *prudencia*; of which three terms you are to make up a fylogifm of the figure and mode in queftion, which will appear to be inconclusive.

The commentators, and fyftematical writers in logic, have fupplied

plied this defect; and given us real examples of every legitimate mode in all the figures. This we must acknowledge to be charitably done, to assist the imagination in the conception of matters so very abstract; but whether it was prudently done for the honour of the art, may be doubted. I am afraid this was to uncover the nakedness of the theory; and has contributed much to bring it into contempt: for when one considers the silly and un-instructive reasonings that have been brought forth by this grand organ of science, he can hardly forbear crying out, *Parturiunt montes, et nascitur ridiculus mus*. Many of the writers of logic are acute and ingenious, and much practised in the syllogistical art; and there must be some reason why the examples they have given of syllogisms are so lean.

We shall speak of the reason afterwards; and shall now give a syllogism in each figure as an example.

No work of God is bad;

The natural passions and appetites of men are the work of God;

Therefore none of them is bad.

In this syllogism, the middle term, *work of God*, is the subject of the major and the predicate of the minor; so that the syllogism is of the first figure. The mode is that called *Celarent*; the major and conclusion being both universal negatives, and the minor an universal affirmative. It agrees to the rules of the figure, as the major is universal, and the minor affirmative; it is also agreeable to all the general rules; so that it maintains its character in every trial. And to show of what ductile materials syllogisms are made, we may, by converting simply the major proposition, reduce it to a good syllogism of the second figure, and of the mode *Cesare*, thus:

Whatever is bad is not the work of God;

All the natural passions and appetites of men are the work of God;

Therefore they are not bad.

Another

Another example :

Every thing virtuous is praise-worthy ;

Some pleasures are not praise-worthy ;

Therefore some pleasures are not virtuous.

Here the middle term *praise-worthy* being the predicate of both premises, the syllogism is of the second figure ; and seeing it is made up of the propositions, A, O, O, the mode is *Baroco*. It will be found to agree both with the general and special rules : and it may be reduced into a good syllogism of the first figure upon converting the major by contraposition, thus :

What is not praise-worthy is not virtuous ;

Some pleasures are not praise-worthy ;

Therefore some pleasures are not virtuous.

That this syllogism is conclusive, common sense pronounces, and all logicians must allow ; but it is somewhat unpliant to rules, and requires a little straining to make it tally with them.

That it is of the first figure is beyond dispute ; but to what mode of that figure shall we refer it ? This is a question of some difficulty. For, in the first place, the premises seem to be both negative, which contradicts the third general rule ; and moreover, it is contrary to a special rule of the first figure, That the minor should be negative. These are the difficulties to be removed.

Some logicians think, that the two negative particles in the major are equivalent to an affirmative ; and that therefore the major proposition, *What is not praise-worthy, is not virtuous*, is to be accounted an affirmative proposition. This, if granted, solves one difficulty ; but the other remains. The most ingenious solution, therefore, is this : Let the middle term be *not praise-worthy*. Thus, making the negative particle a part of the middle term, the syllogism stands thus :

Whatever is *not praise-worthy* is not virtuous ;

Some pleasures are *not praise-worthy* ;

Therefore some pleasures are not virtuous.

By

By this analysis, the major becomes an universal negative, the minor a particular affirmative, and the conclusion a particular negative, and so we have a just syllogism in *Ferio*.

We see, by this example, that the quality of propositions is not so invariable, but that, when occasion requires, an affirmative may be degraded into a negative, or a negative exalted to an affirmative. Another example:

All Africans are black;
All Africans are men;
Therefore some men are black.

This is of the third figure, and of the mode *Darapti*; and it may be reduced to *Darii* in the first figure, by converting the minor.

All Africans are black;
Some men are Africans;
Therefore some men are black.

By this time I apprehend the reader has got as many examples of syllogisms as will stay his appetite for that kind of entertainment.

SECT. 4. On the Demonstration of the Theory.

Aristotle and all his followers have thought it necessary, in order to bring this theory of categorical syllogisms to a science, to demonstrate, both that the fourteen authorised modes conclude justly, and that none of the rest do. Let us now see how this has been executed.

As to the legitimate modes, Aristotle, and those who follow him the most closely, demonstrate the four modes of the first figure directly from an axiom called the *Dictum de omni et nullo*. The amount of the axiom is, That what is affirmed of a whole genus, may

may be affirmed of all the species and individuals belonging to that *genus*; and that what is denied of the whole genus, may be denied of its species and individuals. The four modes of the first figure are evidently included in this axiom. And as to the legitimate modes of the other figures, they are proved by reducing them to some mode of the first. Nor is there any other principle assumed in these reductions but the axioms concerning the conversion of propositions, and in some cases the axioms concerning the opposition of propositions.

As to the illegitimate modes, Aristotle has taken the labour to try and condemn them one by one in all the three figures: but this is done in such a manner that it is very painful to follow him. To give a specimen. In order to prove, that those modes of the first figure in which the major is particular, do not conclude, he proceeds thus: "If A is or is not in some B, and B in every C, no conclusion follows. Take for the terms in the affirmative case, *good, habit, prudence*, in the negative, *good, habit, ignorance*." This laconic style, the use of symbols not familiar, and, in place of giving an example, his leaving us to form one from three assigned terms, give such embarrassment to a reader, that he is like one reading a book of riddles.

Having thus ascertained the true and false modes of a figure, he subjoins the particular rules of that figure, which seem to be deduced from the particular cases before determined. The general rules come last of all, as a general corollary from what goes before.

I know not whether it is from a diffidence of Aristotle's demonstrations, or from an apprehension of their obscurity, or from a desire of improving upon his method, that almost all the writers in logic I have met with, have inverted his order, beginning where he ends, and ending where he begins. They first demonstrate the general rules, which belong to all the figures, from three

three axioms ; then from the general rules and the nature of each figure, they demonstrate the special rules of each figure. When this is done, nothing remains but to apply these general and special rules, and to reject every mode which contradicts them.

This method has a very scientific appearance ; and when we consider, that by a few rules once demonstrated, an hundred and seventy-eight false modes are destroyed at one blow, which Aristotle had the trouble to put to death one by one, it seems to be a great improvement. I have only one objection to the three axioms.

The three axioms are these : 1. Things which agree with the same third, agree with one another. 2. When one agrees with the third, and the other does not, they do not agree with one another. 3. When neither agrees with the third, you cannot thence conclude, either that they do, or do not agree with one another. If these axioms are applied to mathematical quantities, to which they seem to relate when taken literally, they have all the evidence which an axiom ought to have : but the logicians apply them in an analogical sense to things of another nature. In order, therefore, to judge whether they are truly axioms, we ought to strip them of their figurative dress, and to set them down in plain English, as the logicians understand them. They amount therefore to this. 1. If two things be affirmed of a third, or the third be affirmed of them ; or if one be affirmed of the third, and the third affirmed of the other ; then they may be affirmed one of the other. 2. If one is affirmed of the third, or the third of it, and the other denied of the third, or the third of it, they may be denied one of the other. 3. If both are denied of the third, or the third of them ; or if one is denied of the third, and the third denied of the other ; nothing can be inferred.

When the three axioms are thus put in plain English, they seem not to have that degree of evidence which axioms ought to have ;

and if there is any defect of evidence in the axioms, this defect will be communicated to the whole edifice raised upon them.

It may even be suspected, that an attempt, by any method, to demonstrate, that a syllogism is conclusive, is an impropriety somewhat like that of attempting to demonstrate an axiom. In a just syllogism, the connection between the premises and the conclusion is not only real, but immediate; so that no proposition can come between them to make their connection more apparent. The very intention of a syllogism is, to leave nothing to be supplied that is necessary to a complete demonstration. Therefore a man of common understanding, who has a perfect comprehension of the premises, finds himself under a necessity of admitting the conclusion, supposing the premises to be true; and the conclusion is connected with the premises with all the force of intuitive evidence. In a word, an immediate conclusion is seen in the premises, by the light of common sense; and where that is wanting, no kind of reasoning will supply its place.

SECT. 5. *On this Theory, considered as an Engine of Science.*

The slow progress of useful knowledge, during the many ages in which the syllogistic art was most highly cultivated as the only guide to science, and its quick progress since that art was disused, suggest a presumption against it; and this presumption is strengthened by the puerility of the examples which have always been brought to illustrate its rules.

The ancients seem to have had too high notions, both of the force of the reasoning power in man, and of the art of syllogism as its guide. Mere reasoning can carry us but a very little way in most subjects. By observation, and experiments properly conducted, the stock of human knowledge may be enlarged without end; but the power of

of reasoning alone, applied with vigour through a long life, would only carry a man round, like a horse in a mill, who labours hard, but makes no progress. There is indeed an exception to this observation in the mathematical sciences. The relations of quantity are so various, and so susceptible of exact mensuration, that long trains of accurate reasoning on that subject may be formed, and conclusions drawn very remote from the first principles. It is in this science, and those which depend upon it, that the power of reasoning triumphs: in other matters its trophies are inconsiderable. If any man doubt this, let him produce, in any subject unconnected with mathematics, a train of reasoning of some length, leading to a conclusion, which without this train of reasoning would never have been brought within human sight. Every man acquainted with mathematics can produce thousands of such trains of reasoning. I do not say, that none such can be produced in other sciences; but I believe they are few, and not easily found; and that if they are found, it will not be in subjects that can be expressed by categorical propositions, to which alone the theory of figure and mode extends.

In matters to which that theory extends, a man of good sense, who can distinguish things that differ, and avoid the snares of ambiguous words, and is moderately practised in such matters, sees at once all that can be inferred from his premises; or finds, that there is but a very short step to the conclusion.

When the power of reasoning is so feeble by nature, especially in subjects to which this theory can be applied, it would be unreasonable to expect great effects from it. And hence we see the reason why the examples brought to illustrate it by the most ingenious logicians, have rather tended to bring it into contempt.

If it should be thought, that the syllogistic art may be an useful engine in mathematics, in which pure reasoning has ample scope: First, It may be observed, That facts are unfavourable to

this opinion : for it does not appear, that Euclid, or Apollonius, or Archimedes, or Hugen, or Newton, ever made the least use of this art ; and I am even of opinion, that no use can be made of it in mathematics. I would not wish to advance this rashly, since Aristotle has said, that mathematicians reason for the most part in the first figure. What led him to think so was, that the first figure only yields conclusions that are universal and affirmative, and the conclusions of mathematics are commonly of that kind. But it is to be observed, that the propositions of mathematics are not categorical propositions, consisting of one subject and one predicate. They express some relation which one quantity bears to another, and on that account must have three terms. The quantities compared make two, and the relation between them is a third. Now to such propositions we can neither apply the rules concerning the conversion of propositions, nor can they enter into a syllogism of any of the figures or modes. We observed before, that this conversion, *A is greater than B, therefore B is less than A*, does not fall within the rules of conversion given by Aristotle or the logicians ; and we now add, that this simple reasoning, *A is equal to B, and B to C ; therefore A is equal to C*, cannot be brought into any syllogism in figure and mode. There are indeed syllogisms into which mathematical propositions may enter, and of such we shall afterwards speak : but they have nothing to do with the system of figure and mode.

When we go without the circle of the mathematical sciences, I know nothing in which there seems to be so much demonstration as in that part of logic which treats of the figures and modes of syllogism ; but the few remarks we have made, shew, that it has some weak places : and besides, this system cannot be used as an engine to rear itself.

The compass of the syllogistic system as an engine of science, may be discerned by a compendious and general view of the conclusion

clusion drawn, and the argument used to prove it, in each of the three figures.

In the first figure, the conclusion affirms or denies something, of a certain species or individual; and the argument to prove this conclusion is, That the same thing may be affirmed or denied of the whole genus to which that species or individual belongs.

In the second figure, the conclusion is, That some species or individual does not belong to such a genus; and the argument is, That some attribute common to the whole genus does not belong to that species or individual.

In the third figure, the conclusion is, That such an attribute belongs to part of a genus; and the argument is, That the attribute in question belongs to a species or individual which is part of that genus.

I apprehend, that, in this short view, every conclusion that falls within the compass of the three figures, as well as the mean of proof, is comprehended. The rules of all the figures might be easily deduced from it; and it appears, that there is only one principle of reasoning in all the three; so that it is not strange, that a syllogism of one figure should be reduced to one of another figure.

The general principle in which the whole terminates, and of which every categorical syllogism is only a particular application, is this, That what is affirmed or denied of the whole genus, may be affirmed or denied of every species and individual belonging to it. This is a principle of undoubted certainty indeed, but of no great depth. Aristotle and all the logicians assume it as an axiom or first principle, from which the syllogistic system, as it were, takes its departure: and after a tedious voyage, and great expence of demonstration, it lands at last in this principle as its ultimate conclusion. *O curas hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane!*

SECT.

SECT. 6. *On Modal Syllogisms.*

Categorical propositions, besides their quantity and quality, have another affection, by which they are divided into pure and modal. In a pure proposition, the predicate is barely affirmed or denied of the subject; but in a modal proposition, the affirmation or negation is modified, by being declared to be necessary or contingent, or possible or impossible. These are the four modes observed by Aristotle, from which he denominates a proposition modal. His genuine disciples maintain, that these are all the modes that can affect an affirmation or negation, and that the enumeration is complete. Others maintain, that this enumeration is incomplete; and that when an affirmation or negation is said to be certain or uncertain, probable or improbable, this makes a modal proposition; no less than the four modes of Aristotle. We shall not enter into this dispute; but proceed to observe, that the epithets of *pure* and *modal* are applied to syllogisms as well as to propositions. A pure syllogism is that in which both premises are pure propositions. A modal syllogism is that in which either of the premises is a modal proposition.

The syllogisms of which we have already said so much, are those only which are pure as well as categorical. But when we consider, that through all the figures and modes, a syllogism may have one premise modal of any of the four modes, while the other is pure, or it may have both premises modal, and that they may be either of the same mode or of different modes; what prodigious variety arises from all these combinations? Now it is the business of a logician, to shew how the conclusion is affected in all this variety of cases. Aristotle has done this in his First Analytics, with immense labour; and it will not be thought strange, that

that when he had employed only four chapters in discussing one hundred and ninety-two modes, true and false, of pure syllogisms, he should employ fifteen upon modal syllogisms.

I am very willing to excuse myself from entering upon this great branch of logic, by the judgement and example of those who cannot be charged either with want of respect to Aristotle, or with a low esteem of the syllogistic art.

Keckerman, a famous Dantzican professor, who spent his life in teaching and writing logic, in his huge folio system of that science, published ann. 1600, calls the doctrine of the modals the *crux logicorum*. With regard to the scholastic doctors, among whom this was a proverb, *De modalibus non gustabit asinus*, he thinks it very dubious, whether they tortured most the modal syllogisms, or were most tortured by them. But those crabbed geniuses, says he, made this doctrine so very thorny, that it is fitter to tear a man's wits in pieces than to give them solidity. He desires it to be observed, that the doctrine of the modals is adapted to the Greek language. The modal terms were frequently used by the Greeks in their disputations; and, on that account, are so fully handled by Aristotle: but in the Latin tongue you shall hardly ever meet with them. Nor do I remember, in all my experience, says he, to have observed any man in danger of being foiled in a dispute, through his ignorance of the modals.

This author, however, out of respect to Aristotle, treats pretty fully of modal propositions, shewing how to distinguish their subject and predicate, their quantity and quality. But the modal syllogisms he passes over altogether.

Ludovicus Vives, whom I mention, not as a devotee of Aristotle, but on account of his own judgement and learning, thinks that the doctrine of modals ought to be banished out of logic, and remitted to grammar; and that if the grammar of the Greek tongue had been brought to a system in the time of Aristotle, that

most

most acute philosopher would have saved the great labour he has bestowed on this subject.

Burgersdick, after enumerating five classes of modal syllogisms, observes, that they require many rules and cautions, which Aristotle hath handled diligently; but as the use of them is not great, and their rules are very difficult, he thinks it not worth while to enter into the discussion of them; recommending to those who would understand them, the most learned paraphrase of Joannes Monlorius, upon the first book of the First Analytics.

All the writers of logic for two hundred years back that have fallen into my hands, have passed over the rules of modal syllogisms with as little ceremony. So that this great branch of the doctrine of syllogism, so diligently handled by Aristotle, fell into neglect, if not contempt, even while the doctrine of pure syllogisms continued in the highest esteem. Moved by these authorities, I shall let this doctrine rest in peace, without giving the least disturbance to its ashes.

SECT. 7. *On Syllogisms that do not belong to Figure and Mode.*

Aristotle gives some observations upon imperfect syllogisms: such as, the Enthimema, in which one of the premises is not expressed but understood: Induction, wherein we collect an universal from a full enumeration of particulars: and Examples, which are an imperfect induction. The logicians have copied Aristotle upon these kinds of reasoning, without any considerable improvement. But to compensate the modal syllogisms, which they have laid aside, they have given rules for several kinds of syllogism, of which Aristotle takes no notice. These may be reduced to two classes.

The first class comprehends the syllogisms into which any exclusive,

five, restrictive, exceptive, or reduplicative proposition enters. Such propositions are by some called *exponible*, by others *imperfectly modal*. The rules given with regard to these are obvious, from a just interpretation of the propositions.

The second class is that of hypothetical syllogisms, which take that denomination from having a hypothetical proposition for one or both premises. Most logicians give the name of *hypothetical* to all complex propositions which have more terms than one subject and one predicate. I use the word in this large sense; and mean by hypothetical syllogisms, all those in which either of the premises consists of more terms than two. How many various kinds there may be of such syllogisms, has never been ascertained. The logicians have given names to some; such as, the copulative, the conditional, by some called hypothetical, and the disjunctive.

Such syllogisms cannot be tried by the rules of figure and mode. Every kind would require rules peculiar to it. Logicians have given rules for some kinds; but there are many that have not so much as a name.

The Dilemma is considered by most logicians as a species of the disjunctive syllogism. A remarkable property of this kind is, that it may sometimes be happily retorted: it is, it seems, like a hand-grenade, which, by dextrous management, may be thrown back, so as to spend its force upon the assailant. We shall conclude this tedious account of syllogisms, with a dilemma mentioned by *A. Gellius*, and from him by many logicians, as infoluble in any other way.

“ Euathlus, a rich young man, desirous of learning the art of
“ pleading, applied to Protagoras, a celebrated sophist, to instruct
“ him, promising a great sum of money as his reward; one half
“ of which was paid down; the other half he bound himself to
“ pay as soon as he should plead a cause before the judges, and
“ gain

" gain it. Protagoras found him a very apt scholar ; but, after
 " he had made good progress, he was in no haste to plead cau-
 " ses. The master, conceiving that he intended by this means to
 " shift off his second payment, took, as he thought, a sure me-
 " thod to get the better of his delay. He sued Euathlus before
 " the judges ; and, having opened his cause at the bar, he pleaded
 " to this purpose. O most foolish young man, do you not see,
 " that, in any event, I must gain my point ? for if the judges
 " give sentence for me, you must pay by their sentence ; if a-
 " gainst me, the condition of our bargain is fulfilled, and you
 " have no plea left for your delay, after having pleaded and gained
 " a cause. To which Euathlus answered. O most wise master,
 " I might have avoided the force of your argument, by not
 " pleading my own cause. But, giving up this advantage, do
 " you not see, that whatever sentence the judges pass, I am safe ?
 " If they give sentence for me, I am acquitted by their sentence ;
 " if against me, the condition of our bargain is not fulfilled, by
 " my pleading a cause, and losing it. The judges, thinking the
 " arguments unanswerable on both sides, put off the cause to a
 " long day."

When the premises are certain, and the conclusion drawn from
 them in due form, this is demonstration, and produces science.
 Such syllogisms are called *scientific*, and are handled in the two
 books of the *Last Analytics*. When the premises are not certain,
 but probable only, such syllogisms are called *dialectical*; and of
 them he treats in the eight books of the *Topics*. But there are
 some syllogisms which seem to be perfect both in matter and form,
 which are not really so, as a false may seem beautiful which
 is but painted. These being apt to deceive, and produce a false
 opinion, are called *sophistical*; and they are the subject of the book
 concerning *sophisms*.

C H A P.

To return to the *Last Analytics*, which treat of demonstration
 and

gain it. Protagoras found him a very apt scholar; but, after he had made good progress, he was in no haste to plead cause. The master, conceiving that he intended by this means to thrust off his second payment, took as he thought, a sure method to get the better of his delay. He tried, therefore, before the judges; and, having opened his cause at the bar, he pleaded

Account of the remaining books of the Organon.

that, in any event, I must gain my point; for if the judges give sentence for me, you must pay by their sentence; if against me, the condition of our bargain is not fulfilled, and you have no plea left for your delay, after having pleaded and gained

IN the First Analytics, syllogisms are considered in respect of their form; they are now to be considered in respect of their matter. The form lies in the necessary connection between the premises and the conclusion; and where such a connection is wanting, they are said to be informal, or vicious in point of form.

But where there is no fault in the form, there may be in the matter; that is, in the propositions of which they are composed, which may be true or false, probable or improbable.

When the premises are certain, and the conclusion drawn from them in due form, this is demonstration, and produces science. Such syllogisms are called *apodictical*; and are handled in the two books of the Last Analytics. When the premises are not certain, but probable only, such syllogisms are called *dialectical*; and of them he treats in the eight books of the Topicks. But there are some syllogisms which seem to be perfect both in matter and form, when they are not really so: as, a face may seem beautiful which is but painted. These being apt to deceive, and produce a false opinion, are called *sophistical*; and they are the subject of the book concerning Sophisms.

To return to the Last Analytics, which treat of demonstration

and of science : We shall not pretend to abridge those books ; for Aristotle's writings do not admit of abridgement : no man can say what he says in fewer words ; and he is not often guilty of repetition. We shall only give some of his capital conclusions, omitting his long reasonings and nice distinctions, of which his genius was wonderfully productive.

All demonstration must be built upon principles already known ; and these upon others of the same kind ; until we come at last to first principles, which neither can be demonstrated, nor need to be, being evident of themselves.

We cannot demonstrate things in a circle, supporting the conclusion by the premises, and the premises again by the conclusion. Nor can there be an infinite number of middle terms between the first principle and the conclusion.

In all demonstration, the first principles, the conclusion, and all the intermediate propositions, must be necessary, general, and eternal truths : for of things fortuitous, contingent, or mutable, or of individual things, there is no demonstration.

Some demonstrations prove only, that the thing is thus affected ; others prove, why it is thus affected. The former may be drawn from a remote cause, or from an effect : but the latter must be drawn from an immediate cause ; and are the most perfect.

The first figure is best adapted to demonstration, because it affords conclusions universally affirmative ; and this figure is commonly used by the mathematicians.

The demonstration of an affirmative proposition is preferable to that of a negative ; the demonstration of an universal to that of a particular ; and direct demonstration to that *ad absurdum*.

The principles are more certain than the conclusion.

There cannot be opinion and science of the same thing at the same time.

In the second book we are taught, that the questions that may be

be put, with regard to any thing, are four: 1. Whether the thing be thus affected. 2. Why it is thus affected. 3. Whether it exists. 4. What it is.

The last of these questions Aristotle, in good Greek, calls the *What it is* of a thing. The schoolmen, in very barbarous Latin, called this, the *quiddity* of a thing. This quiddity, he proves by many arguments, cannot be demonstrated, but must be fixed by a definition. This gives occasion to treat of definition, and how a right definition should be formed. As an example he gives a definition of the number *three*, and defines it to be the first odd number.

In this book he treats also of the four kinds of causes; efficient, material, formal, and final.

Another thing treated of in this book is, the manner in which we acquire first principles, which are the foundation of all demonstration. These are not innate, because we may be for a great part of life ignorant of them: nor can they be deduced demonstratively from any antecedent knowledge, otherwise they would not be first principles. Therefore he concludes, that first principles are got by induction, from the informations of sense. The senses give us informations of individual things, and from these by induction we draw general conclusions: for it is a maxim with Aristotle, That there is nothing in the understanding which was not before in some sense.

The knowledge of first principles, as it is not acquired by demonstration, ought not to be called science; and therefore he calls it *intelligence*.

The principles are more certain than the conclusion.

There cannot be opinion and science of the same thing at the same time.

SECT.

In the second book we are taught, that the questions that may

be

SECT. 2. *Of the Topics.*

The professed design of the Topics is, to shew a method by which a man may be able to reason with probability and consistency upon every question that may occur.

Every question is either about the genus of the subject, or its specific difference, or some thing proper to it, or something accidental.

To prove that this division is complete, Aristotle reasons thus: Whatever is attributed to a subject, it must either be, that the subject can be reciprocally attributed to it, or that it cannot. If the subject and attribute can be reciprocated, the attribute either declares what the subject is, and then it is a definition; or it does not declare what the subject is, and then it is a property. If the attribute cannot be reciprocated, it must be something contained in the definition, or not. If it is contained in the definition of the subject, it must be the genus of the subject, or its specific difference; for the definition consists of these two. If it is not contained in the definition of the subject, it must be an accident.

The furniture proper to fit a man for arguing dialectically may be reduced to these four heads: 1. Probable propositions of all sorts, which may on occasion be assumed in an argument. 2. Distinctions of words which are nearly of the same signification. 3. Distinctions of things which are not so far asunder but that they may be taken for one and the same. 4. Similitudes.

The second and the five following books are taken up in enumerating the topics or heads of argument that may be used in questions about the genus, the definition, the properties, and the accidents of a thing; and occasionally he introduces the topics for proving

proving things to be the same, or different; and the topics for proving one thing to be better or worse than another.

In this enumeration of topics, Aristotle has shewn more the fertility of his genius, than the accuracy of method. The writers of logic seem to be of this opinion: for I know none of them that has followed him closely upon this subject. They have considered the topics of argumentation as reducible to certain axioms. For instance, when the question is about the genus of a thing, it must be determined by some axiom about genus and species; when it is about a definition, it must be determined by some axiom relating to definition, and things defined: and so of other questions. They have therefore reduced the doctrine of the topics to certain axioms or canons, and disposed these axioms in order under certain heads.

This method seems to be more commodious and elegant than that of Aristotle. Yet it must be acknowledged, that Aristotle has furnished the materials from which all the logicians have borrowed their doctrine of topics: and even Cicero, Quintilian, and other rhetorical writers, have been much indebted to the topics of Aristotle.

He was the first, as far as I know, who made an attempt of this kind: and in this he acted up to the magnanimity of his own genius, and that of ancient philosophy. Every subject of human thought had been reduced to ten categories; every thing that can be attributed to any subject, to five predicables: he attempted to reduce all the forms of reasoning to fixed rules of figure and mode, and to reduce all the topics of argumentation under certain heads; and by that means to collect as it were into one store all that can be said on one side or the other of every question, and provide a grand arsenal, from which all future combatants might be furnished with arms offensive and defensive in every cause, so as to leave no room to future generations to invent any thing new.

The

The last book of the Topics is a code of the laws, according to which a fyllogistical disputation ought to be managed, both on the part of the assailant and defendant. From which it is evident, that this philosopher trained his disciples to contend, not for the truth merely, but for victory.

SECT. 3. *Of the book concerning Sophisms.*

A fyllogism which leads to a false conclusion, must be vicious, either in matter or form: for from true principles nothing but truth can be justly deduced. If the matter be faulty, that is, if either of the premises be false, that premise must be denied by the defendant. If the form be faulty, some rule of fyllogism is transgressed; and it is the part of the defendant to shew, what general or special rule it is that is transgressed. So that, if he is an able logician, he will be impregnable in the defence of truth, and may resist all the attacks of the sophist. But as there are fyllogisms which may seem to be perfect both in matter and form, when they are not really so, as a piece of money may seem to be good coin, when it is adulterate; such fallacious fyllogisms are considered in this treatise, in order to make a defendant more expert in the use of his defensive weapons.

And here the author, with his usual magnanimity, attempts to bring all the fallacies that can enter into a fyllogism under thirteen heads; of which six lie in the diction or language, and seven not in the diction.

The fallacies in diction are, 1. When an ambiguous word is taken at one time in one sense, and at another time in another. 2. When an ambiguous phrase is taken in the same manner. 3. and 4. are ambiguities in syntax; when words are conjoined in syntax that ought to be disjoined; or disjoined when they ought

ought to be conjoined. 5. is an ambiguity in prosody, accent, or pronunciation. 6. An ambiguity arising from some figure of speech.

When a sophism of any of these kinds is translated into another language, or even rendered into unambiguous expressions in the same language, the fallacy is evident, and the syllogism appears to have four terms.

The seven fallacies which are said not to be in the diction, but in the thing, have their proper names in Greek and in Latin, by which they are distinguished. Without minding their names, we shall give a brief account of their nature.

1. The first is, Taking an accidental conjunction of things for a natural or necessary connection: as, when from an accident we infer a property; when from an example we infer a rule; when from a single act we infer a habit.

2. Taking that absolutely which ought to be taken comparatively, or with a certain limitation. The construction of language often leads into this fallacy: for in all languages it is common to use absolute terms, to signify things which carry in them some secret comparison; or to use unlimited terms, to signify what from its nature must be limited.

3. Taking that for the cause of a thing which was only an occasion, or concomitant.

4. Begging the question. This is done, when the thing to be proved, or some thing equivalent, is assumed in the premises.

5. Mistaking the question. When the conclusion of the syllogism is not the thing that ought to be proved, but something else that is mistaken for it.

6. When that which is not a consequence is mistaken for a consequence; as if, because all Africans are black, it were taken for granted that all blacks are Africans.

7. The last fallacy lies in propositions that are complex, and

imply two affirmations, whereof one may be true, and the other false; so that whether you grant the proposition, or deny it, you are intangled: as when it is affirmed, that such a man has left off playing the fool. If it be granted, it implies, that he did play the fool formerly. If it be denied, it implies, or seems to imply, that he plays the fool still.

In this enumeration, we ought, in justice to Aristotle, to expect only the fallacies incident to categorical syllogisms. And I do not find, that the logicians have made any additions to it when taken in this view; altho' they have given some other fallacies that are incident to syllogisms of the hypothetical kind, particularly the fallacy of an incomplete enumeration in disjunctive syllogisms and dilemmas.

The different species of sophisms above mentioned are not so precisely defined by Aristotle, or by subsequent logicians, but that they allow of great latitude in the application; and it is often dubious under what particular species a sophistical syllogism ought to be classed. We even find the same example brought under one species by one author, and under another species by another. Nay, what is more strange, Aristotle himself employs a long chapter in proving by a particular induction, that all the seven may be brought under that which we have called *mistaking the question*, and which is commonly called *ignoratio elenchi*. And indeed the proof of this is easy, without that laborious detail which Aristotle uses for the purpose: for if you lop off from the conclusion of a sophistical syllogism all that is not supported by the premises, the conclusion, in that case, will always be found different from that which ought to have been proved; and so it falls under the *ignoratio elenchi*.

It was probably Aristotle's aim, to reduce all the possible variety of sophisms, as he had attempted to do of just syllogisms, to certain definite species: but he seems to be sensible that he had fallen

fallen short in this last attempt. When a genus is properly divided into its species, the species should not only, when taken together, exhaust the whole genus; but every species should have its own precinct so accurately defined, that one shall not encroach upon another. And when an individual can be said to belong to two or three different species, the division is imperfect; yet this is the case of Aristotle's division of the sophisms, by his own acknowledgement. It ought not therefore to be taken for a division strictly logical. It may rather be compared to the several species or forms of action invented in law for the redress of wrongs. For every wrong there is a remedy in law by one action or another: but sometimes a man may take his choice among several different actions. So every sophistical syllogism may, by a little art, be brought under one or other of the species mentioned by Aristotle, and very often you may take your choice of two or three.

Besides the enumeration of the various kinds of sophisms, there are many other things in this treatise concerning the art of managing a syllogistical dispute with an antagonist. And indeed, if the passion for this kind of litigation, which reigned for so many ages, should ever again lift up its head, we may predict, that the Organon of Aristotle will then become a fashionable study: for it contains such admirable materials and documents for this art, that it may be said to have brought it to a science.

The conclusion of this treatise ought not to be overlooked: it manifestly relates, not to the present treatise only, but also to the whole analytics and topics of the author. I shall therefore give the substance of it.

“Of those who may be called inventors, some have made important additions to things long before begun, and carried on through a course of ages; others have given a small beginning to things which, in succeeding times, will be brought to greater perfection. The beginning of a thing, though small, is the

“ chief part of it, and requires the greatest degree of invention ;
“ for it is easy to make additions to inventions once begun. Now
“ with regard to the dialectical art, there was not something done,
“ and something remaining to be done. There was absolutely
“ nothing done : for those who professed the art of disputation,
“ had only a set of orations composed, and of arguments, and
“ of captious questions, which might suit many occasions. These
“ their scholars soon learned, and fitted to the occasion. This
“ was not to teach you the art, but to furnish you with the mate-
“ rials produced by the art : as if a man professing to teach you
“ the art of making shoes, should bring you a parcel of shoes of
“ various sizes and shapes, from which you may provide those
“ who want. This may have its use ; but it is not to teach the
“ art of making shoes. And indeed, with regard to rhetorical
“ declamation, there are many precepts handed down from an-
“ cient times ; but with regard to the construction of syllogisms,
“ not one.
“ We have therefore employed much time and labour upon
“ this subject ; and if our system appears to you not to be in the
“ number of those things, which, being before carried a certain
“ length, were left to be perfected ; we hope for your favourable
“ acceptance of what is done, and your indulgence in what is left
“ imperfect.”

C H A P.

C H A P. VI.

Reflections on the Utility of Logic, and the Means of its Improvement.

SECT. I. *Of the Utility of Logic.*

MEN rarely leave one extreme without running into the contrary. It is no wonder, therefore, that the excessive admiration of Aristotle, which continued for so many ages, should end in an undue contempt; and that the high esteem of logic as the grand engine of science, should at last make way for too unfavourable an opinion, which seems now prevalent, of its being unworthy of a place in a liberal education. Those who think according to the fashion, as the greatest part of men do, will be as prone to go into this extreme, as their grandfathers were to go into the contrary.

Laying aside prejudice, whether fashionable or unfashionable, let us consider whether logic is, or may be made, subservient to any good purpose. Its professed end is, to teach men to think, to judge, and to reason, with precision and accuracy. No man will say that this is a matter of no importance; the only thing, therefore, that admits of doubt, is, whether it can be taught.

To resolve this doubt, it may be observed, that our rational faculty is the gift of God, given to men in very different measure. Some have a larger portion, some a less; and where there is a remarkable defect of the natural power, it cannot be supplied by
any

any culture whatsoever. But this natural power, even where it is strongest, may lie dead for want of the means of improvement; and a savage may have been born with as good faculties as a Bacon or a Newton. The amazing difference that appears in advanced life, is owing to this, that the talent of one was buried, being never put to use, while that of the other was cultivated to the best advantage.

It may likewise be observed, that the chief mean of improving our rational power, is the vigorous exercise of it, in various ways, and in different subjects, by which the habit is acquired of exercising it properly. Without such exercise, and good sense over and above, a man who has studied logic all his life may, after all, be only a petulant wrangler, without true judgement, or skill of reasoning, in any science.

I take this to be Locke's meaning, when, in his *Thoughts on Education*, he says, "If you would have your son to reason well, let him read Chillingworth." The state of things is much altered since Locke wrote. Logic has been much improved, chiefly by his writings; and yet much less stress is laid upon it, and less time consumed in it. His counsel, therefore, was judicious and seasonable; to wit, That the improvement of our reasoning power is to be expected much more from an intimate acquaintance with the authors who reason best, than from studying voluminous systems of logic. But if he had meant, that the study of logic was of no use, nor deserved any attention, he surely would not have taken the pains to have made so considerable an addition to it, by his *Essay on the Human Understanding*, and by his *Thoughts on the Conduct of the Understanding*. Nor would he have remitted his pupil to Chillingworth, the acutest logician, as well as the best reasoner, of his age; and one who, in innumerable places of his excellent book, without pedantry even in that pedantic age, makes

makes the happiest application of the rules of logic, for unraveling the sophistical reasoning of his antagonist.

Our reasoning power makes no appearance in infancy; but as we grow up, it unfolds itself by degrees, like the bud of a tree. When a child first draws an inference, or perceives the force of an inference drawn by another person, we may call this *the birth of his reason*: but it is yet like a new-born babe, weak and tender; it must be cherished, and carried in arms, and have food of easy digestion, till it gathers strength.

I believe no man remembers this birth of his reason; but it is probable that his decisions will at first be weak and wavering; and, compared with that steady conviction which he acquires in ripe years, will be like the dawn of the morning compared with noon-day. We see that the reason of children yields to authority, as a reed to the wind; nay, that it clings to it, and leans upon it, as if conscious of its own weakness.

When reason acquires such strength as to stand on its own bottom, without the aid of authority, or even in opposition to authority, this may be called its *manly age*. But in most men, it hardly ever arrives at this period. Many, by their situation in life, have not the opportunity of cultivating their rational powers. Many, from the habit they have acquired, of submitting their opinions to the authority of others, or from some other principle which operates more powerfully than the love of truth, suffer their judgment to be carried along, to the end of their days, either by the authority of a leader, or of a party, or of the multitude, or by their own passions. Such persons, however learned, however acute, may be said to be all their days children in understanding. They reason, they dispute, and perhaps write; but it is not that they may find the truth; but that they may defend opinions which have descended to them by inheritance, or into which they have fallen by accident, or been led by affection.

I agree with Mr Locke, that there is no study better fitted to exercise and strengthen the reasoning powers, than that of the mathematical sciences; for two reasons; first, Because there is no other branch of science which gives such scope to long and accurate trains of reasoning; and, secondly, Because in mathematics there is no room for authority, or for prejudice of any kind, which may give a false bias to the judgement.

When a youth of moderate parts begins to study Euclid, every thing at first is new to him. His apprehension is unsteady; his judgement is feeble; and rests partly upon the evidence of the thing, and partly upon the authority of his teacher. But every time he goes over the definitions, the axioms, the elementary propositions, more light breaks in upon him; the language becomes familiar, and conveys clear and steady conceptions; the judgement is confirmed; he begins to see what demonstration is; and it is impossible to see it without being charmed with it. He perceives it to be a kind of evidence which has no need of authority to strengthen it. He finds himself emancipated from that bondage, and exults so much in this new state of independence, that he spurns at authority, and would have demonstration for every thing; until experience teaches him, that this is a kind of evidence which cannot be had in most things; and that in his most important concerns, he must rest contented with probability.

As he goes on in mathematics, the road of demonstration becomes smooth and easy; he can walk in it firmly, and take wider steps: and, at last, he acquires the habit, not only of understanding a demonstration, but of discovering and demonstrating mathematical truths.

Thus, a man without rules of logic, may acquire the habit of reasoning justly in mathematics; and, I believe, he may, by like means, acquire the habit of reasoning justly in mechanics, in jurisprudence,

jurisprudence, in politics, or in any other science. Good sense, good examples, and assiduous exercise, may bring a man to reason justly and acutely in his own profession, without rules.

But if any man think, that from this concession he may infer the inutility of logic, he betrays a great want of that art by this inference: for it is no better reasoning than this, That because a man may go from Edinburgh to London by the way of Paris, therefore any other road is useless.

There is perhaps no practical art which may not be acquired, in a very considerable degree, by example and practice, without reducing it to rules. But practice, joined with rules, may carry a man on in his art farther and more quickly, than practice without rules. Every ingenious artist knows the utility of having his art reduced to rules, and by that means made a science. He is thereby enlightened in his practice, and works with more assurance. By rules, he sometimes corrects his own errors, and often detects the errors of others: he finds them of great use to confirm his judgement, to justify what is right, and to condemn what is wrong.

Is it of no use in reasoning, to be well acquainted with the various powers of the human understanding, by which we reason? Is it of no use, to resolve the various kinds of reasoning into their simple elements; and to discover, as far as we are able, the rules by which those elements are combined in judging and in reasoning? Is it of no use, to mark the various fallacies in reasoning, by which even the most ingenious men have been led into error? It must surely betray great want of understanding, to think these things useless or unimportant. These are the things which logicians have attempted; and which they have executed; not indeed so completely as to leave no room for improvement, but in such a manner as to give very considerable aid to our reasoning powers. That the principles laid down with regard to definition

and division, with regard to the conversion and opposition of propositions and the general rules of reasoning, are not without use, is sufficiently apparent from the blunders committed by those who disdain any acquaintance with them.

Although the art of categorical syllogism is better fitted for scholastic litigation, than for real improvement in knowledge, it is a venerable piece of antiquity, and a great effort of human genius. We admire the pyramids of Egypt, and the wall of China, tho' useless burdens upon the earth. We can bear the most minute description of them, and travel hundreds of leagues to see them. If any person should, with sacrilegious hands, destroy or deface them, his memory would be had in abhorrence. The predicaments and predicables, the rules of syllogism, and the topics, have a like title to our veneration as antiquities: they are uncommon efforts, not of human power, but of human genius; and they make a remarkable period in the progress of human reason.

The prejudice against logic has probably been strengthened by its being taught too early in life. Boys are often taught logic as they are taught their creed, when it is an exercise of memory only, without understanding. One may as well expect to understand grammar before he can speak, as to understand logic before he can reason. It must even be acknowledged, that commonly we are capable of reasoning in mathematics more early than in logic. The objects presented to the mind in this science, are of a very abstract nature, and can be distinctly conceived only when we are capable of attentive reflection upon the operations of our own understanding, and after we have been accustomed to reason. There may be an elementary logic, level to the capacity of those who have been but little exercised in reasoning; but the most important parts of this science require a ripe understanding, capable of reflecting

reflecting upon its own operations. Therefore to make logic the first branch of science that is to be taught, is an old error that ought to be corrected.

Although the art of categorical syllogism is better fitted for school-

SECT. 2. *Of the Improvement of Logic.* It is a venerable piece of antiquity, and a great effort of human genius.

In compositions of human thought expressed by speech or by writing, whatever is excellent and whatever is faulty, fall within the province, either of grammar, or of rhetoric, or of logic. Propriety of expression is the province of grammar; grace, elegance, and force, in thought and in expression, are the province of rhetoric; justness and accuracy of thought are the province of logic.

The faults in composition, therefore, which fall under the censure of logic, are obscure and indistinct conceptions, false judgment, inconclusive reasoning, and all improprieties in distinctions, definitions, division, or method. To aid our rational powers, in avoiding these faults and in attaining the opposite excellencies, is the end of logic: and whatever there is in it that has no tendency to promote this end, ought to be thrown out.

The rules of logic being of a very abstract nature, ought to be illustrated by a variety of real and striking examples taken from the writings of good authors. It is both instructive and entertaining, to observe the virtues of accurate composition in writers of fame. We cannot see them, without being drawn to the imitation of them, in a more powerful manner than we can be by dry rules. Nor are the faults of such writers less instructive or less powerful monitors. A wreck left upon a shoal, or upon a rock, is not more useful to the sailor, than the faults of good writers, when set up to view, are to those who come after them. It was a

happy thought in a late ingenious writer of English grammar, to collect under the several rules, examples of bad English found in the most approved authors. It were to be wished that the rules of logic were illustrated in the same manner. By this means, a system of logic would become a repository; wherein whatever is most acute in judging and in reasoning, whatever is most accurate in dividing, distinguishing, and defining, should be laid up and disposed in order for our imitation; and wherein the false steps of eminent authors should be recorded for our admonition.

After men had laboured in the search of truth near two thousand years, by the help of syllogisms, Lord Bacon proposed the method of induction, as a more effectual engine for that purpose. His *Novum Organum* gave a new turn to the thoughts and labours of the inquisitive, more remarkable, and more useful, than that which the *Organum* of Aristotle had given before; and may be considered as a second grand æra in the progress of human reason.

The art of syllogism produced numberless disputes, and numberless sects, who fought against each other with much animosity, without gaining or losing ground; but did nothing considerable for the benefit of human life. The art of induction, first delineated by Lord Bacon, produced numberless laboratories and observatories, in which Nature has been put to the question by thousands of experiments, and forced to confess many of her secrets, which before were hid from mortals. And by these, arts have been improved, and human knowledge wonderfully increased.

In reasoning by syllogism, from general principles we descend to a conclusion virtually contained in them. The process of induction is more arduous; being an ascent from particular premises to a general conclusion. The evidence of such general conclusions is not demonstrative, but probable: but when the induction

tion is sufficiently copious, and carried on according to the rules of art, it forces conviction no less than demonstration itself does.

The greatest part of human knowledge rests upon evidence of this kind. Indeed we can have no other for general truths which are contingent in their nature, and depend upon the will and ordination of the maker of the world. He governs the world he has made, by general laws. The effects of these laws, in particular phenomena are open to our observation; and by observing a train of uniform effects with due caution, we may at last decypher the law of nature, by which they are regulated.

Lord Bacon has displayed no less force of genius in reducing to rules this method of reasoning, than Aristotle did in the method of syllogism. His *Novum Organum* ought therefore to be held as a most important addition to the ancient logic. Those who understand it, and enter into the spirit of it, will be able to distinguish the chaff from the wheat in philosophical disquisitions into the works of God. They will learn to hold in due contempt all hypotheses and theories, the creatures of human imagination, and to respect nothing but facts sufficiently vouched, or conclusions drawn from them by a fair and chaste interpretation of nature.

Most arts have been reduced to rules, after they had been brought to a considerable degree of perfection by the natural sagacity of artists; and the rules have been drawn from the best examples of the art that had been before exhibited: but the art of philosophical induction was delineated by Lord Bacon in a very ample manner, before the world had seen any tolerable example of it. This, altho' it adds greatly to the merit of the author, must have produced some obscurity in the work, and a defect of proper examples for illustration. This defect may now be easily supplied, from those authors who, in their philosophical disquisitions, have most strictly pursued the path pointed out in the *Novum Organum*. Among these Sir Isaac Newton seems to hold the first rank, having,

in

in the third book of his *Principia*, and in his *Optics*, had the rules of the *Novum Organum* constantly in his eye. I think Lord Bacon was also the first who endeavoured to reduce to a system the prejudices or bialles of the mind; which are the causes of false judgement, and which he calls *the idols of the human understanding*. Some late writers of logic have very properly introduced this into their system; but it deserves to be more copiously handled, and to be illustrated by real examples. It is of great consequence to accurate reasoning, to distinguish first principles which are to be taken for granted, from propositions which require proof. All the real knowledge of mankind may be divided into two parts: the first consisting of self-evident propositions; the second, of those which are deduced by just reasoning from self-evident propositions. The line which divides these two parts ought to be marked as distinctly as possible, and the principles that are self-evident reduced, as far as can be done, to general axioms. This has been done in mathematics from the beginning, and has tended greatly to the emolument of that science. It has lately been done in natural philosophy: and by this means that science has advanced more in an hundred and fifty years, than it had done before in two thousand. Every science is in an unformed state until its first principles are ascertained: after that is done, it advances regularly, and secures the ground it has gained. Altho' first principles do not admit of direct proof, yet there must be certain marks and characters, by which those that are truly such may be distinguished from counterfeits. These marks ought to be described, and applied, to distinguish the genuine from the spurious. In the ancient philosophy there is a redundancy, rather than a defect, of first principles. Many things were assumed under that character without a just title: That nature abhors a vacuum; That

That bodies do not gravitate in their proper place; That the heavenly bodies undergo no change; That they move in perfect circles, and with an equable motion. Such principles as these were assumed in the Peripatetic philosophy, without proof, as if they were self-evident.

Des Cartes, sensible of this weakness in the ancient philosophy, and desirous to guard against it in his own system, resolved to admit nothing until his assent was forced by irresistible evidence. The first thing which he found to be certain and evident was, that he thought, and reasoned, and doubted. He found himself under a necessity of believing the existence of those operations of mind of which he was conscious: and having thus found fast footing in this one principle of consciousness, he rested satisfied with it, hoping to be able to build the whole fabric of his knowledge upon it; like Archimedes, who wanted but one fixed point to move the whole earth. But the foundation was too narrow; and in his progress he unawares assumes many things less evident than those which he attempts to prove. Altho' he was not able to suspect the testimony of consciousness, yet he thought the testimony of sense, of memory, and of every other faculty, might be suspected, and ought not to be received until proof was brought that they are not fallacious. Therefore he applies these faculties, whose character is yet in question, to prove, That there is an infinitely perfect Being, who made him, and who made his senses, his memory, his reason, and all his faculties. That this Being is no deceiver, and therefore could not give him faculties that are fallacious; and that on this account they deserve credit.

It is strange, that this philosopher, who found himself under a necessity of yielding to the testimony of consciousness, did not find the same necessity of yielding to the testimony of his senses, his memory, and his understanding; and that while he was certain that he doubted, and reasoned, he was uncertain whether two

and

and three made five, and whether he was dreaming or awake. It is more strange, that so acute a reasoner should not perceive, that his whole train of reasoning to prove that his faculties were not fallacious, was mere sophistry: for if his faculties were fallacious, they might deceive him in this train of reasoning; and so the conclusion, That they were not fallacious, was only the testimony of his faculties in their own favour, and might be a fallacy.

It is difficult to give any reason for distrusting our other faculties, that will not reach consciousness itself. And he who distrusts those faculties of judging and reasoning which God hath given him, must even rest in his scepticism till he come to a sound mind, or until God give him new faculties to fit in judgement upon the old. If it be not a first principle, That our faculties are not fallacious, we must be absolute sceptics: for this principle is incapable of proof; and if it is not certain, nothing else can be certain.

Since the time of Des Cartes, it has been fashionable with those who dealt in abstract philosophy, to employ their invention in finding philosophical arguments, either to prove those truths which ought to be received as first principles, or to overturn them: and it is not easy to say, whether the authority of first principles is more hurt by the first of these attempts, or by the last; for such principles can stand secure only upon their own bottom; and to place them upon any other foundation than that of their intrinsic evidence, is in effect to overturn them.

I have lately met with a very sensible and judicious treatise, wrote by Father Buffier about fifty years ago, concerning first principles, and the source of human judgements, which, with great propriety, he prefixed to his treatise of logic. And indeed I apprehend it is a subject of such consequence, that if inquisitive men

men can be brought to the same unanimity in the first principles of the other sciences, as in those of mathematics and natural philosophy, (and why should we despair of a general agreement in things that are self-evident?), this might be considered as a third grand æra in the progress of human reason.

S K E T C H . I I .

Principles and Progress of MORALITY.

THE science of morals, like other sciences, is in a very imperfect state among savages; and arrives at maturity among enlightened nations by very slow degrees. This progress points out the historical part, as first in order: but as that history would give little satisfaction, without a rule for comparing the morals of different ages, and of different nations, I begin with the principles of morality, such as ought to govern at all times, and in all nations. The present sketch accordingly is divided into two parts. In the first, the principles are unfolded; and the second is altogether historical.

P A R T I .

PRINCIPLES of MORALITY.

S E C T . I .

HUMAN ACTIONS *analysed.*

THE hand of God is no where more visible, than in the nice adjustment of our internal frame to our situation in this world. An animal is endued with a power of self-motion; and

in

in performing animal functions, requires not any external aid. This more especially is the case of man, the noblest of terrestrial beings. His heart beats, his blood circulates, his stomach digests, evacuations proceed, &c. &c. By what means? Not surely by the laws of mechanism, which are far from being adequate to such operations. The operations mentioned are effects of an internal power, bestow'd on man for preserving life. The power is exerted uniformly, and without interruption, independent of will, and without consciousness.

Man is a being susceptible of pleasure and pain: these generate desire to attain what is agreeable, and to shun what is disagreeable; and he is enabled by other powers to gratify his desires. One power, termed *instinct*, is exerted indeed with consciousness; but blindly, without will, and without intention to produce any effect. Brute animals act for the most part by instinct: hunger prompts them to eat, and cold, to take shelter; knowingly indeed, but without exerting any act of will, and without foresight of what will happen. Infants of the human species, little superior to brutes, are, like brutes, governed by instinct: they lay hold of the nipple, without knowing that sucking will satisfy their hunger; and they weep when pained, without any view of relief*. Another power is governed by intention and will. In the progress from infancy to maturity, the mind opens to objects, with-

* Akin to these, are certain habitual acts done without thought, such as snuffing or grinning. Custom enables one to move the fingers on an instrument of music, without being directed by will: the motion is often too quick for an act of will. Some arrive at great perfection in the art of balancing: the slightest deviation from the just balance is instantly redressed: were a preceding act of will necessary, it would be too late. An unexpected hollow in walking, occasions a violent shock: is not this evidence, that external motion is governed by the mind, frequently without consciousness; and that in walking, the body is adjusted beforehand to what is expected?

out end, of desire and of aversion, the attaining or shunning of which depend more or less on our own will. We are placed in a wide world, left to our own conduct; and we are by nature provided with a proper power for performing what we intend and will. The actions we perform by this power are termed *voluntary*. There still remain another species of actions, termed *involuntary*; as where we act by some irresistible motive against our will. An action may be voluntary, tho' done with reluctance; as where a man, to free himself from torture, reveals the secrets of his friend: his confession is voluntary, tho' drawn from him with great reluctance. But let us suppose, that after the firmest resolution to reveal nothing, his mind is unhinged by exquisite torture; the discovery he makes may be justly termed *involuntary*: he speaks indeed; but he is compelled to it absolutely against his will.

Man is by his nature an accountable being, answerable for his conduct to God and man. In doing any action that wears a double face, he is prompted by his nature to explain the same to his relations, his friends, his acquaintance; and above all, to those who have authority over him. He hopes for praise for every right action, and dreads blame for every one that is wrong. But for what sort of actions does he hold himself accountable? Not surely for an instinctive action, which is done blindly, without intention, and without will: neither for an involuntary action, because it is extorted from him against his will: and least of all, for actions done without consciousness, such as those which preserve life. What only remain are voluntary actions, which are either right or wrong. Such actions are done wittingly and willingly: for these we must answer, if at all accountable; and for these every man in conscience holds himself bound to answer.

And now more particularly upon voluntary actions. To intend and to will, tho' commonly held synonymous, signify different
acts

acts of the mind. Intention respects the effect: Will respects the action that is exerted for producing the effect. It is my intention, for example, to relieve my friend from distress: upon seeing him, it is my Will to give him a sum for his relief: the external act of giving follows; and my friend is relieved, which is the effect intended. But these internal acts, tho' in their nature different, are always united: I cannot will the means, without intending the effect; and I cannot intend the effect, without willing the means*.

Some effects of voluntary action follow necessarily: A wound is an effect that necessarily follows the stabbing a person with a dagger: death is a necessary effect of throwing one down from the battlements of a high tower. Some effects are probable only: I labour in order to provide for my family; fight for my country to rescue it from oppressors; take physic for my health. In such cases, the event intended does not necessarily nor always follow.

A man, when he wills to act, must intend the necessary effect: a person who stabs, certainly intends to wound. But where the effect is probable only, a man may act without intending the effect that follows: a stone thrown by me at random into the market-place, may happen to wound a man without my intending it. One acts by instinct, without either will or intention: voluntary actions that necessarily produce their effect, imply intention: voluntary actions, when the effect is probable only, are sometimes intended, sometimes not.

Human actions are distinguished from each other by certain qualities, termed *right* and *wrong*. But as these make the cornerstone of morality, they are reserved to the following section.

* To incline, to resolve, to intend, to will, are acts of the mind relative to external action. These several acts are well understood; tho' they cannot be defined, being perfectly simple.

S E C T.

S E C T. II.

Division of Human Actions into RIGHT, WRONG, and INDIFFERENT.

THE qualities of right and wrong in voluntary actions, are universally acknowledged as the foundation of morality; and yet philosophers have been strangely perplexed about them. The history of their various opinions, would signify little but to darken the subject: the reader will have more satisfaction in seeing these qualities explained, without entering at all into controversy.

No person is ignorant of primary and secondary qualities, a distinction much insisted on by philosophers. Primary qualities, such as figure, cohesion, weight, are permanent qualities, that exist in a subject whether perceived or not. Secondary qualities, such as colour, taste, smell, depend on the percipient as much as on the subject, being nothing when not perceived. Beauty and ugliness are qualities of the latter sort: they have no existence but when perceived; and, like all other secondary qualities, they are perceived intuitively; having no dependence on reason nor on judgement, more than colour has, or smell, or taste (a).

The qualities of right and wrong in voluntary actions, are secondary, like beauty and ugliness, and the other secondary qualities mentioned. Like them, they are objects of intuitive perception, and depend not in any degree on reason or on judgement.

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1 p. 207. edit. 5.

ment. No argument is requisite to prove, that to rescue an innocent babe from the jaws of a wolf, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, are right actions: they are perceived to be so intuitively. As little is an argument requisite to prove, that murder, deceit, perjury, are wrong actions: they are perceived intuitively to be so. The Deity has bestow'd on man, different faculties for different purposes. Truth and falsehood are investigated by the reasoning faculty. Beauty and ugliness are objects of a sense, known by the name of *taste*. Right and wrong are objects of a sense termed the *moral sense* or *conscience*. And supposing these qualities to be hid from our perception, in vain would we try to discover them by any argument, or process of reasoning: the attempt would be absurd; no less so than an attempt to discover colour, by reasoning, or taste, or smell*.

Right and wrong, as mentioned above, are qualities of voluntary actions, and of no other kind. An instinctive action is beneficial, is agreeable; but it cannot properly be denominated either right or wrong. An involuntary act is hurtful to the agent, and disagreeable to the spectator; but in the agent it is neither right nor wrong. These qualities also depend in no degree on the event. Thus, if, to save my friend from drowning, I plunge into a river, the action is right, tho' I happen to come too late.

* Every perception must proceed from some faculty or power of perception, termed *sense*. The moral sense, by which we perceive the qualities of right and wrong, may be considered either as a branch of the sense of seeing, by which we perceive the actions to which these qualities belong, or as a sense distinct from all others. The senses by which objects are perceived, are not separated from each other by distinct boundaries; and the sorting, or classing them, seems to depend more on taste and fancy, than on nature. I have followed the plan laid down by former writers; which is, to consider the moral sense as a sense distinct from others, because it is the easiest and clearest manner of conceiving it.

And

And if I aim a stroke at a man behind his back, the action is wrong, tho' I happen not to touch him.

The qualities of right and of agreeable, are inseparable; and so are the qualities of wrong and of disagreeable. A right action, accordingly, is agreeable, not only in the direct perception, but equally so in every subsequent recollection. And in both circumstances equally, a wrong action is disagreeable.

Right actions are distinguished by the moral sense into two kinds, viz. what *ought* to be done, and what *may* be done, or left undone. Wrong actions admit not that distinction: they are all prohibited to be done. To say that an action *ought* to be done, means that we are tied or obliged to perform; and to say that an action *ought* not to be done, means that we are restrained from doing it. Tho' the necessity implied in the being tied or obliged, is not physical, but only what is commonly termed *moral*; yet we conceive ourselves deprived of liberty or freedom, and necessarily bound to act or to forbear acting, in opposition to every other motive. The necessity here described is termed *duty*. The moral necessity we are under to forbear harming the innocent, is a proper example: the moral sense declares the restraint to be our duty, which no motive whatever will excuse us for transgressing.

The duty of performing or forbearing any action, implies a *right* in some person to exact performance of that duty; and accordingly, a duty or obligation necessarily infers a corresponding right. A promise on my part to pay L. 100, confers a right to demand performance. The man who commits an injury, violates the *right* of the person injured, which entitles him to demand reparation of the wrong.

Duty is twofold; duty to others, and duty to ourselves. With respect to the former, the doing what we ought to do, is termed *just*: the doing what we ought not to do, and the omitting what

we

we ought to do, are termed *unjust*. With respect to ourselves, the doing what we ought to do, is termed *proper*; the doing what we ought not to do, and the omitting what we ought to do, are termed *improper*. Thus, *right*, signifying a quality of certain actions, is a genus; of which *just* and *proper* are species: *wrong*, signifying a quality of other actions, is a genus; of which *unjust* and *improper* are species.

Right actions left to our free will, to be done, or left undone, come next in order. They are, like the former, right when done; but they differ, in not being wrong when left undone. To remit a just debt for the sake of a growing family, to yield a subject in controversy rather than go to law with a neighbour, generously to return good for ill, are examples of this species. They are universally approved as right actions: but as no person has a right or title to oblige us to perform such actions, the leaving them undone is not a wrong: no person is injured by the forbearance. Actions that come under this class, shall be termed *arbitrary*, for want of a more proper designation.

So much for right actions, and their divisions. Wrong actions are of two kinds, *criminal* and *culpable*. What are done intentionally to produce mischief, are criminal: such rash or unguarded actions as produce mischief without intention, are culpable. The former are restrained by punishment, to be handled in the 5th section; the latter by reparation, to be handled in the 6th.

The divisions of voluntary actions are not yet exhausted. Some there are that, properly speaking, cannot be denominated either right or wrong. Actions done merely for amusement or pastime, without intention to produce good or ill, are of that kind; leaping, for example, running, jumping over a stick, throwing a stone to make circles in the water. Such actions are neither approved nor disapproved: they may be termed *indifferent*.

There is no cause for doubting the existence of the moral sense,

more than for doubting the existence of the sense of beauty, of seeing, or of hearing. In fact, the perception of right and wrong as qualities of actions, is no less distinct and clear, than that of beauty, of colour, or of any other quality; and as every perception is an act of sense, the sense of beauty is not with greater certainty evinced from the perception of beauty, than the moral sense is from the perception of right and wrong. We find this sense distributed among individuals in different degrees of perfection: but there perhaps never existed any one above the condition of an idiot, who possessed it not in some degree; and were any man entirely destitute of it, the terms *right* and *wrong* would be to him no less unintelligible, than the term colour is to one born blind.

That every individual is endued with a sense of right and wrong, more or less distinct, will probably be granted; but whether there be among men what may be termed a *common sense* of right and wrong, producing uniformity of opinion as to right and wrong, is not so evident. There is no absurdity in supposing the opinions of men about right and wrong, to be as various as about beauty and deformity: and that this supposition is not destitute of foundation, we are led to suspect, upon discovering that in different countries, and even in the same country at different times, the opinions publicly espoused with regard to right and wrong, are extremely various; that among some nations it was held lawful for a man to sell his children for slaves, and in their infancy to abandon them to wild beasts; that it was held equally lawful to punish children, even capitally, for the crime of their parent; that the murdering an enemy in cold blood, was once a common practice; that human sacrifices, impious no less than immoral according to our notions, were of old universal; that even in later times, it has been held meritorious, to inflict cruel torments for the slightest deviations from the religious creed
of

of the plurality; and that among the most enlightened nations, there are considerable differences with respect to the rules of morality.

These facts tend not to disprove the reality of a common sense in morals: they only prove, that the moral sense has not been equally perfect at all times, nor in all countries. This branch of the history of morality, is reserved for the second part. To give some present satisfaction, I shall shortly observe, that the savage state is the infancy of man; during which, the more delicate senses lie dormant, leaving nations to the authority of custom, of imitation, and of passion, without any just taste of morals more than of the fine arts. But nations, like individuals, ripen gradually, and acquire a refined taste in morals as well as in the fine arts: after which we find great uniformity of opinion about the rules of right and wrong; with few exceptions, but what may proceed from imbecility, or corrupted education. There may be found, it is true, even in the most enlightened ages, men who have singular notions of morality; and there may be found the like singularity upon many other subjects: which no more affords an argument against a common sense or standard of right and wrong, than a monster doth against the standard that regulates our external form, or than an exception doth against the truth of a general proposition.

That there is in mankind an uniformity of opinion with respect to right and wrong, is a matter of fact of which the only infallible evidence is observation and experience: and to that evidence I appeal; entering only a caveat, that, for the reason above given, the enquiry be confined to enlightened nations. In the mean time, I take liberty to suggest an argument from analogy, That if there be great uniformity among the different tribes of men in seeing and hearing, in pleasure and pain, in judging of truth and error, the same uniformity ought to hold with respect

to right and wrong. Whatever minute differences there may be to distinguish one person from another, yet in the general principles that constitute our nature, internal and external, there is wonderful uniformity.

This uniformity of sentiment, which may be termed *the common sense of mankind with respect to right and wrong*, is essential to social beings. Did the moral sentiments of men differ as much as their faces, they would be altogether unqualified for society: discord and controversy would be endless, and *major vis* would be the only rule of *meum et tuum*.

But such uniformity of sentiment, tho' general, is not altogether universal: men there are, as above mentioned, who differ from the common sense of mankind with respect to various points of morality. What ought to be the conduct of such men? ought they to regulate their conduct by that standard, or by their private conviction? There will be occasion afterward to observe, that we judge of others as we believe they judge of themselves; and that private conviction is the standard for rewards and punishments (a). But with respect to every controversy about property and pecuniary interest, and, in general, about every civil right and obligation, the common sense of mankind is the standard, and not private conviction or conscience; which I shall endeavour to make out as follows.

We have an innate sense of a common nature, not only in our own species, but in every species of animals. And that the fact corresponds to our sense of it, is verified by experience; for there appears a remarkable uniformity in creatures of the same kind, and a difformity, no less remarkable, in creatures of a different kind. As that common nature is perceived to be a model or standard for each individual of the kind, it raises wonder to find

(a) See §. 3.

an individual deviating from the common nature of the species, whether in its internal or external structure: a child born with aversion to its mother's milk, is a wonder, no less than if born without a mouth, or with more than one.

Secondly, The innate sense mentioned dictates, that the common nature of man in particular, is invariable as well as universal; that it will be the same hereafter as it is at present, and as it was in time past, the same among all nations, and in all corners of the earth: nor are we deceived; because, allowing for slight differences occasioned by culture and other accidental circumstances, the fact corresponds to our perception.

Thirdly, We perceive that this common nature is *right* and *perfect*, and that it *ought* to be a model or standard for every human being. Any remarkable deviation from it in the structure of an individual, appears imperfect or irregular; and raises a painful emotion: a monstrous birth, exciting curiosity in philosophers, fails not at the same time to excite aversion in every spectator.

This sense of perfection in the common nature of man, comprehends every branch of his nature, and particularly the common sense of mankind with respect to right and wrong; which accordingly is perceived by all to be perfect, having authority over all men as the ultimate and unerring standard of morals, even in contradiction to private conviction. Thus, a law in our nature binds us to regulate our conduct by that standard: its authority is universally acknowledged, as nothing is more common in every dispute about *meum et tuum*, than an appeal to it as the ultimate and unerring standard.

At the same time, as that standard, through infirmity or prejudice, is not conspicuous to every individual, many are misled into erroneous opinions, by mistaking a false standard for that of nature. And hence a distinction between a right and a wrong sense in morals; a distinction which every one understands, but
which,

which, unless for the conviction of a moral standard, would be altogether unintelligible.

The final cause of this branch of our nature is conspicuous. Were there no standard of right and wrong for determining endless controversies about matters of interest, the strong would have recourse to force, the weak to cunning, and society would be intolerable. Courts of law could afford no remedy; for without a standard of morals, their decisions would be arbitrary, and of no authority. Happy it is for men to be provided with such a standard: it is necessary in society that our actions be uniform with respect to right and wrong; and in order to uniformity of action, it is necessary that our perceptions of right and wrong be also uniform: to produce such uniformity, a standard of morals is indispensable. Nature has provided us with that standard, which is daily apply'd by courts of law with success.

In reviewing what is said, it must afford great satisfaction, to find morality established upon the most solid of all foundations, viz. intuitive perception, which is not only a single mental act, but is complete in itself, having no dependence on any antecedent proposition. The most accurate reasoning affords not equal conviction; for every sort of reasoning, as explained in the sketch immediately foregoing, requires not only self-evident truths or axioms to found upon, but employs over and above various propositions to bring out its conclusions. By intuitive perception solely, without reasoning, we acquire knowledge of right and wrong; of what we may do, of what we ought to do, and of what we ought to abstain from: and considering that we have thus greater certainty of moral laws, than of any proposition discoverable by reasoning, man may well be deemed a favourite of heaven, when he is so admirably qualified for acting the part that is agreeable to his Maker. The moral sense or conscience is the voice of God within us; constantly admonishing us of our duty, and requiring

quiring from us no exercise of our faculties but attention merely. The celebrated Locke ventured what he thought a bold conjecture, That moral duties might be susceptible of demonstration: how agreeable would the discovery have been to him, that they are founded upon intuitive perception, still more convincing and authoritative!

By one branch of the moral sense, we are taught what we ought to do, and what we ought not to do; and by another branch, what we may do, or leave undone. But society would be imperfect, if the moral sense stopped here. There is no particular that tends more to complete society, than what is mentioned in the first section, viz. That every man is accountable for his conduct to his fellow-creatures; and he is rendered accountable by a third branch of the moral sense, which teaches him, that this is his duty. And it will be made evident afterward, in the 3d sketch, that we are accountable to our Maker, as well as to our fellow-creatures.

To complete this theory, I add, that an action is right or wrong, independent of the actor's own opinion. Thus, when a man, excited by friendship or pity, rescues a heretic from the flames, the action is right, even tho' he think it wrong, from a conviction that heretics ought to be burnt. But we apply a different rule to those who act: a man is approved, and held to be innocent, when he does what he himself thinks right; he is disapproved, and held to be guilty, when he does what he himself thinks wrong. Thus, to assassinate an atheist for the sake of religion, is a wrong action; and yet the enthusiast who commits that wrong, may be innocent: and one is guilty who, against conscience, eats meat in lent, tho' the action is not wrong. In short, an action is perceived to be right or wrong, independent of the actor's own opinion: but he is approved or disapproved, held to be innocent or guilty, according to his own opinion.

S E C T.

S E C T. III.

Laws of Nature respecting our MORAL CONDUCT IN SOCIETY.

A Standard being thus established for regulating our moral conduct in society, we proceed to investigate the laws that result from it. But first we take under consideration, what other principles concur with the moral sense to qualify men for society.

When we reflect on the different branches of human knowledge, it might seem, that of all subjects human nature should be the best understood; because every man has daily opportunities to study it, in his own passions and in his own actions. But human nature, an interesting subject, is seldom left to the investigation of philosophy. Writers of a sweet disposition and warm imagination hold, that man is a benevolent being, and that every man ought to direct his conduct for the good of all, without regarding himself but as one of the number (a). Those of a cold temperament, and contracted mind, hold him to be an animal entirely selfish; to evince which, examples are accumulated without end (b). Neither of these systems is that of nature. The selfish system is contradicted by the experience of all ages, affording the clearest evidence, that men frequently act for the sake of others, without regarding themselves, and sometimes in direct opposition to their own interest. And however much selfishness may prevail

(a) Lord Shaftesbury.

(b) Helvetius.

in action, it certainly prevails not in sentiment and affection: all men conspire to put a high estimation upon generosity, benevolence, and other social virtues; while even the most selfish are disgusted with selfishness in others, and endeavour to hide it in themselves. The most zealous patron of the selfish principle will not venture to maintain, that it renders us altogether indifferent about our fellow-creatures. Laying aside self-interest, with every connection of love and hatred, good fortune happening to any one is agreeable to all, and bad fortune happening to any one is disagreeable to all. On the other hand, the system of universal benevolence, is no less contradictory to experience; from which we learn, that men commonly are disposed to prefer their own interest before that of others, especially where there is no strict connection: nor do we find that such bias is opposed by the moral sense. Man in fact is a complex being, composed of principles, some benevolent, some selfish: and these principles are so justly blended in his nature, as to fit him for acting a proper part in society. It would indeed be losing time to prove, that without some affection for his fellow-creatures he would be ill qualified for society. And it will be made evident afterward (a), that universal benevolence would be more hurtful to society, than even absolute selfishness *.

(a) Sect. 4.

* “ Many moralists enter so deeply into one passion or bias of human nature, that, to use the painter’s phrase, they quite overcharge it. Thus I have seen a whole system of morals founded upon a single pillar of the inward frame; and the entire conduct of life, and all the characters in it, accounted for, sometimes from superstition, sometimes from pride, and most commonly from interest. They forget how various a creature it is they are painting; how many springs and weights, nicely adjusted and balanced, enter into the movement, and require allowance to be made for their several clogs and impulses, ere you can describe its operation and effects.” *Enquiry into the life and writings of Homer.*

We are now prepared for investigating the laws that result from the foregoing principles. The several duties we owe to others shall be first discussed, taking them in order, according to the extent of their influence. And for the sake of perspicuity, I shall first present them in a general view, and then proceed to particulars. Of our duties to others, one there is so extensive, as to have for its object all the innocent part of mankind. It is the duty that prohibits us to hurt others: than which no law is more clearly dictated by the moral sense; nor is the transgression of any other law more deeply stamped with the character of wrong. A man may be hurt externally in his goods, in his person, in his relations, and in his reputation. Hence the laws, Do not steal; Defraud not others; Do not kill nor wound; Be not guilty of defamation. A man may be hurt internally, by an action that occasions to him distress of mind, or by being impressed with false notions of men and things. Therefore conscience dictates, that we ought not to treat men disrespectfully; that we ought not causelessly to alienate their affections from others; and, in general, that we ought to forbear whatever may tend to break their peace of mind, or tend to unqualify them for being good men, and good citizens.

The duties mentioned are duties of restraint. Our active duties regard particular persons; such as our relations, our friends, our benefactors, our masters, our servants. It is our duty to honour and obey our parents; and to establish our children in the world with all advantages internal and external: we ought to be faithful to our friends, grateful to our benefactors, submissive to our masters, kind to our servants, and to aid and comfort every one of these persons when in distress. To be obliged to do good to others beyond these bounds, must depend on positive engagement; for, as will appear afterward, universal benevolence is not a duty.

This

This general sketch will prepare us for particulars. The duty of restraint comes first in view, that which bars us from harming the innocent; and to it corresponds a right in the innocent to be safe from harm. This is the great law preparatory to society; because without it, society could never have existed. Here the moral sense is inflexible: it dictates, that we ought to submit to any distress, even death itself, rather than procure our own safety by laying violent hands upon an innocent person. And we are under the same restraint with respect to the property of another; for robbery and theft are never upon any pretext indulged. It is indeed true, that in extreme hunger I may lawfully take food where it can be found; and may freely lay hold of my neighbour's horse, to carry me from an enemy who threatens death. But it is his duty as a fellow-creature to assist me in distress; and when there is no time for delay, I may lawfully use what he ought to offer were he present, and what I may presume he would offer. For the same reason, if in a storm my ship be driven among the anchor-ropes of another ship, I may lawfully cut the ropes in order to get free. But in every case of this kind, it would be a wrong in me to use my neighbour's property, without resolving to pay the value. If my neighbour be bound to aid me in distress, conscience binds me to make up his loss *.

The

* This doctrine is obviously founded on justice; and yet, in the Roman law, there are two passages which deny any recompence in such cases. "Item Labeo scribit, si cum vi ventorum navis impulsæ esset in funes anchorarum alterius, et nautæ funes præcidissent; si nullo alio modo, nisi præcisus funibus, explicare se potuit, nullam actionem dandam;" l. 29. § 3. *ad leg. Aquil.* "Quod dicitur damnum injuria datum Aquilia persequi, sic erit accipiendum, ut videatur damnum injuria datum quod cum damno injuriam attulerit; nisi magna vi cogente, fuerit factum. Ut Celsus scribit circa eum, qui incendii arcendi gratia vicinas ædes intercidit: et si pervenit ignis, si ante extinctus est, existimat legis A-

The prohibition of hurting others internally, is perhaps not essential to the formation of societies, because the transgression of that law doth not much alarm plain people: but where manners and refined sentiments prevail, the mind is susceptible of more grievous wounds than the body; and therefore, without that law, a polished society could have no long endurance.

By adultery, mischief is done both external and internal. Each sex is so constituted, as to require strict fidelity and attachment in a mate: and the breach of these duties is the greatest external harm that can befall them: it harms them also internally, by breaking their peace of mind. It has indeed been urged, that no harm will ensue, if the adultery be kept secret; and consequently, that there can be no crime where there is no discovery. But such as reason thus do not advert, that to declare secret adultery to be lawful, is in effect to overturn every foundation of mutual trust and fidelity in the married state. It is clear beyond all doubt, says a reputable writer, that no man is permitted to violate his

"*quiliæ actionem cessare.*" l. 49. § 1. *ead.* — [In English thus: "In the opinion of Labeo, if a ship is driven by the violence of a tempest among the anchor-ropes of another ship, and the sailors cut the ropes, having no other means of getting free, there is no action competent. — The Aquilian law must be understood to apply only to such damage as carries the idea of an injury along with it, unless such injury has not been wilfully done, but from necessity. Thus Celsus puts the case of a person who, to stop the progress of a fire, pulls down his neighbour's house; and whether the fire had reached that house which is pulled down, or was extinguished before it got to it, in neither case, he thinks, will an action be competent from the Aquilian law."] — These opinions are undoubtedly erroneous. And it is not difficult to say what has occasioned the error: the cases mentioned are treated as belonging to the *lex Aquilia*; which being confined to the reparation of wrongs, lays it justly down for a rule, That no action for reparation can lie, where there is no *culpa*. But had Labeo and Celsus adverted, that these cases belong to a different head, viz. the duty of recompense, where one suffers loss by benefiting another, they themselves would have had no difficulty of sustaining a claim for making up that loss.

faith;

faith; and that the man is unjust and barbarous who deprives his wife of the only reward she has for adhering to the austere duties of her sex. But an unfaithful wife is still more criminal, by dissolving the whole ties of nature: in giving to her husband children that are not his, she betrays both, and joins perfidy to infidelity (a).

Veracity is commonly ranked among the active duties; but erroneously: for if a man be not bound to speak, he cannot be bound to speak truth. It is therefore only a restraining duty, prohibiting us to deceive others, by affirming what is not true. Among the many corresponding principles in the human mind that in conjunction tend to make society comfortable, a principle of veracity *, and a principle that leads us to rely on human testimony, are two: without the latter, the former would be an useless principle; and without the former, the latter would lay us open to fraud and treachery. The moral sense accordingly dictates, that we ought to adhere strictly to truth, without regard to consequences.

It must not be inferred, that we are bound to explain our thoughts, when truth is demanded from us by unlawful means. Words uttered voluntarily, are naturally relied on, as expressing the speaker's mind; and if his mind differ from his words, he tells a lie, and is guilty of deceit. But words drawn from a man

(a) *Emile*, liv. 5.

* Truth is always uppermost, being the natural issue of the mind: it requires no art nor training, no inducement nor temptation, but only that we yield to natural impulse. Lying, on the contrary, is doing violence to our nature; and is never practised, even by the worst of men, without some temptation. Speaking truth is like using our natural food, which we would do from appetite altho' it answered no end: lying is like taking physic, which is nauseous to the taste, and which no man takes but for some end which he cannot otherwise attain. *Dr Reid's Enquiry into the human mind.*

by torture, are no indication of his mind ; and he is not guilty of deceit in uttering whatever words may be agreeable, however alien from his thoughts : if the author of the unlawful violence suffer himself to be deceived, he ought to blame himself, not the speaker.

It need scarce be mentioned, that the duty of veracity excludes not fable, nor any liberty of speech intended for amusement solely.

Active duties, as hinted above, are all of them directed to particular persons. And the first I shall mention is, that which subsists between a parent and child. The relation of parent and child, the strongest that can exist between individuals, binds these persons to exert their utmost powers in mutual good offices. Benevolence among other blood-relations, is also a duty ; but not so indispensable, being proportioned to the inferior degree of relation.

Gratitude is a duty directed to the person who has been kind to us. But tho' gratitude is strictly a duty, the measure of performance, and the kind, are left mostly to our own choice. It is scarce necessary to add, that the active duties now mentioned, are acknowledged by all to be absolutely inflexible, perhaps more so than the restraining duties : many find excuses for doing harm ; but no one hears with patience an excuse for deviating from truth, friendship, or gratitude.

Distress tends to convert benevolence into a duty. But distress alone is not sufficient, without other concurring circumstances : for to relieve every person in distress, is beyond the power of any human being. Our relations in distress claim that duty from us, and even our neighbours : but distant distress, without a particular connection, scarce rouses our sympathy, and never is an object of duty. Many other connections, too numerous for this short essay, extend the duty of relieving others from distress ; and these

these make a large branch of equity. Tho' in various instances, benevolence is thus converted into a duty by distress, it follows not, that the duty is always proportioned to the degree of distress. Nature has more wisely provided for the support of virtue. A virtuous person in distress commands our pity: a vicious person in distress has much less influence; and if by vice he have brought on the distress, indignation is raised, not pity (*a*).

One great advantage of society, is the co-operation of many to accomplish some useful work, where a single hand would be insufficient. Arts, manufactures, and commercial dealings, require many hands: but as hands cannot be secured without a previous engagement, the performance of promises and covenants is, upon that account, a capital duty in society. In their original occupations of hunting and fishing, men living scattered and dispersed, have seldom opportunity to aid and benefit each other; and in that situation, covenants being of little use, are little regarded: but husbandry requiring the co-operation of many hands, draws men together for mutual assistance; and then covenants make a figure: arts and commerce make them more and more necessary; and in a polished society great regard is paid to them.

But contracts and promises are not confined to commercial dealings: they serve also to make benevolence a duty; and are even extended to connect the living with the dead: a man would die with regret, if he thought his friends were not bound by their promises, to fulfil his will after his death: and to quiet the minds of men with respect to futurity, the moral sense makes the performing such promises our duty. Thus, if I promise to my friend to erect a monument for him after his death, conscience binds me, even tho' no person alive be entitled to demand performance: every one perceives this to be my duty; and I must expect to suffer reproach and blame, if I neglect my engagement.

(*a*) See Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 187. edit. 5.

To fulfil a rational promise or covenant, deliberately made, is a duty no less inflexible than those duties are which arise independent of consent. But as man is fallible, often misled by ignorance or error, and liable to be deceived, his condition would be deplorable, did the moral sense compel him to fulfil every engagement, however imprudent or irrational. Here the moral sense gives way to human infirmity: it relieves from deceit, from imposition, from ignorance, from error; and binds a man by no engagement but what answers the end fairly intended.

The other branch of duties, viz. those we owe to ourselves, shall be discussed in a few words. *Propriety*, a branch of the moral sense, regulates our conduct with respect to ourselves; as *Justice*, another branch of the moral sense, regulates our conduct with respect to others. Propriety dictates, that we ought to act up to the dignity of our nature, and to the station allotted us by Providence: it dictates in particular, that temperance, prudence, modesty, and uniformity of conduct, are self-duties. These duties contribute to private happiness, by preserving health, peace of mind, and self-esteem; which are inestimable blessings: they contribute no less to happiness in society, by gaining the love and esteem of others, and aid and support in time of need.

Upon reviewing the foregoing duties respecting others, we find them more or less extensive; but none so extensive as to have for their end the good of mankind in general. The most extensive duty is that of restraint, prohibiting us to harm others: but even that duty has a limited end; for its purpose is only to protect others from mischief, not to do them any positive good. The active duties of doing positive good are circumscribed within still narrower bounds, requiring some relation that connects us with others; such as those of parent, child, friend, benefactor. The slighter relations, unless in peculiar circumstances, are not the foundation of any active duty: neighbourhood, for example, does not

not alone make benevolence a duty: but supposing a neighbour to be in distress, it becomes our duty to relieve him, if it can be done without distress to ourselves. The duty of relieving from distress, seldom goes farther; for tho' we always sympathise with our relations, and with those under our eye, the distress of persons remote and unknown affects us very little. Pactions and agreements become necessary, if we would extend the duty of benevolence, in any particular, beyond the limits mentioned. Men, it is true, are capable of doing more good than is required of them as a duty; but every such good must be a free-will offering.

And this leads to arbitrary actions, viz. those that may be done or left undone; which make the second general head of moral actions. With respect to these, the moral sense leaves us at freedom: a benevolent act is approved, but the omission is not condemned. This holds strictly in single acts; but in viewing the whole of a man's conduct, the moral sense appears to vary a little. As the nature of man is complex, partly social, partly selfish, we have an intuitive perception, that our conduct ought to be conformable to our nature; and that in advancing our own interest, we ought not altogether to neglect that of others. The man accordingly who confines his whole time and thoughts within his own little sphere, is condemned by all the world as guilty of wrong conduct; and the man himself, if his moral perceptions be not blunted by selfishness, must be sensible that he deserves to be condemned. On the other hand, it is possible that free benevolence may be extended beyond proper bounds. The just temperament is a subordination of benevolence to self-love: but where benevolence prevails, it commonly leads to excess, by prompting a man to sacrifice a great interest of his own to a small interest of others; and the moral sense dictates, that such conduct is wrong.

Thus, moral actions are divided into two classes: the first re-

gards our duty, containing actions that ought to be done, and actions that ought not to be done; the other regards arbitrary actions, containing actions that are right when done, but not wrong when left undone. The well-being of society depends more on the first class than on the second: society is indeed promoted by the latter; but it can scarce subsist, unless the former be made our duty. Hence it is, that actions only of the first class are made indispensable; those of the other class being left to our free-will. And hence also it is, that the various propensities that dispose us to actions of the first sort, are distinguished by the name of *primary virtues*; leaving the name of *secondary virtues* to those propensities which dispose us to actions of the other sort *.

The deduction above given makes it evident, that the general tendency of right actions is to promote the good of society, and of wrong actions, to obstruct that good. Universal benevolence is indeed not required of man; because to put that principle in practice, is beyond his utmost abilities. But for promoting the general good, every thing is required of him that he can accomplish; which will appear from reviewing the foregoing duties. The prohibition of harming others is an easy task; and upon that account is made universal. Our active duties are very different: man is circumscribed both in capacity and power: he cannot do good but in a slow succession; and therefore it is wisely ordered, that his obligation to do good should be confined to his relations, his friends, his benefactors. Even distress makes not benevolence a general duty: all a man can readily do, is to relieve those at hand; and accordingly we hear of distant misfortunes with little or no concern.

* Virtue signifies that disposition of mind which gives the ascendant to moral principles. Vice signifies that disposition of mind which gives little or no ascendant to moral principles.

At the same time, let not the moral system be misapprehended, as if it were our duty, or even lawful, to prosecute what upon the whole we reckon the most beneficial to society, balancing ill with good. The moral sense permits not a violation of any person's right, however trivial, whatever benefit may thereby accrue to another. A man, for example, in low circumstances, by denying a debt he owes to a rich miser, saves himself and a hopeful family from ruin. In that case, the good effect far outweighs the ill, or rather has no counterbalance: but the moral sense permits not the debtor to balance ill with good; nor gives countenance to an unjust act, whatever benefit it may produce. And hence a maxim in which all moralists agree, That we must not do ill to bring about even the greatest good; the final cause of which shall be given below (a).

S E C T. IV.

Principles of DUTY and of BENEVOLENCE.

HAVING thus shortly delineated the moral laws of our nature, we proceed to an article of great importance, which is, to enquire into the means provided by our Maker for compelling obedience to these laws. The moral sense is an unerring guide; but the most expert guide will not profit those who are not disposed to follow. This consideration makes it evident, that to com-

(a) Sect. 7.

plete the moral system, we ought to be endued with some principle or propensity, some impulsive power, to enforce obedience to the laws dictated by the moral sense.

The author of our nature leaves none of his works imperfect. In order to render us obsequious to the moral sense as our guide, he hath implanted in our nature the principles of duty, of benevolence, of rewards and punishments, and of reparation. It may possibly be thought, that rewards and punishments, of which afterward, are sufficient of themselves to enforce the laws of nature, without necessity of any other principle. Human laws, it is true, are enforced by these means; because no higher sanction is under command of a terrestrial legislator. But the celestial legislator, with power that knows no control, and benevolence that knows no bounds, hath enforced his laws by means no less remarkable for mildness than for efficacy: he employs no external compulsion; but, in order to engage our will on the right side, hath in the breast of every individual established the principles of duty and of benevolence, which efficaciously excite us to obey the dictates of the moral sense.

As the restraining, as well as active duties, are essential to society, our Maker has wisely ordered, that the principle which enforces these several duties, should be the most cogent of all that belong to our nature. Other principles may solicit, allure, or terrify; but the principle of duty assumes authority, commands, and must be obey'd.

As one great purpose of society, is to furnish opportunities without end of mutual aid and support, nature seconding that purpose, hath provided the principle of benevolence; which excites us to be kindly, beneficent, and generous. Nor ought it to escape observation, that the author of nature, attentive to our wants and to our well-being, hath endued us with a liberal portion of that principle. It enforces benevolence, not only to those we are connected

nected with, but to our neighbours, and even to those we are barely acquainted with. Providence is peculiarly attentive to objects in distress, who require immediate aid and relief. To the general principle of benevolence, it hath superadded the passion of pity, which in every feeling heart is irresistible. To make benevolence more extensive, would be fruitless, because here are objects in plenty to fill the most capacious mind. It would not be fruitless only, but hurtful to society: I say hurtful; for inability to procure gratification, rendering benevolence a troublesome guest, would weaken the principle itself, and attach us the more to selfishness, which we can always gratify. At the same time, tho' there is not room for greater variety of particular objects, yet the faculty we have of uniting numberless individuals in one complex object, enlarges greatly the sphere of benevolence: by that faculty our country, our government, our religion, become objects of public spirit, and of a lively affection. The individuals that compose the group, considered apart, may be too minute, or too distant, for our benevolence; but when comprehended in one great whole, accumulation makes them great, greatness renders them conspicuous; and affection, preserved entire and undivided, is bestow'd upon an abstract object, as upon one that is single and visible; but with much greater energy, being proportioned to its superior dignity and importance. Thus it appears, that the principle of benevolence is not too sparingly scattered among men. It is indeed made subordinate to self-interest, which is wisely ordered, as will afterward be made evident (a); but its power and extent are nicely proportioned to the limited capacity of man, and to his situation in this world; so as better to fulfil its destination, than if it were an overmatch for self-interest, and for every other principle.

(a) Sect. 7.

SECT.

S E C T. V.

Laws respecting REWARDS *and* PUNISHMENTS.

Reflecting on the moral branch of our nature, qualifying us for society in a manner suited to our capacity, we cannot overlook the hand of our Maker; for means so finely adjusted to an important end, never happen by chance. It must however be acknowledged, that in many individuals, the principle of duty has not vigour nor authority sufficient to stem every tide of unruly passion: by the vigilance of some passions, we are taken unguarded; deluded by the sly insinuations of others; or overwhelmed with the stormy impetuosity of a third sort. Moral evil is thus introduced, and much wrong is done. This new scene suggests to us, that there must be some article still wanting, to complete the moral system. The means provided for directing us in the road of duty have been explained: but as in deviating from the road wrongs are committed, nothing hitherto has been said, about redressing such wrongs, nor about preventing the reiteration of them. To accomplish these important ends, there are added to the moral system, laws relative to rewards and punishments, and to reparation; of which in their order.

Many animals are qualified for society by instinct merely; such as beavers, sheep, monkeys, bees, rooks. But men are seldom led by instinct: their actions are commonly prompted by passions; of which there is an endless variety, social and selfish, benevolent and malevolent. And were every passion equally intitled to gratification,

fication, man would be utterly unqualified for society: he would be a ship without a rudder, obedient to every wind, and moving at random, without any ultimate destination. The faculty of reason would make no opposition: for were there no sense of wrong, it would be reasonable to gratify every desire that harms not ourselves: and to talk of punishment would be absurd; for punishment, in its very idea, implies some wrong that ought to be redressed. Hence the necessity of the moral sense, to qualify us for society: by instructing us in our duty, it renders us accountable for our conduct, and makes us susceptible of rewards and punishments. The moral sense fulfils another valuable purpose: it erects in man an unerring standard for the application and measure of rewards and punishments.

To complete the system of rewards and punishments, it is necessary that a provision be made, both of power and of willingness to reward and punish. The author of our nature hath provided amply for the former, by intitling every man to reward and punish as his native privilege. And he has provided for the latter, by a noted principle in our nature, prompting us to exercise the power. Impelled by that principle, we reward the virtuous with approbation and esteem, and punish the vicious with disapprobation and contempt. So prevalent is the principle, that we have great satisfaction in rewarding, and no less in punishing.

As to punishment in particular, an action done intentionally to produce mischief, is criminal, and merits punishment. Such an action, being disagreeable, raises my resentment, even where I have no connection with the person injured; and the principle under consideration impells me to chastise the delinquent with indignation and hatred. An injury done to myself raises my resentment to a higher tone: I am not satisfied with so slight a punishment as indignation and hatred: the author must by my hand suffer mischief, as great as he has made me suffer.

Even

Even the most secret crime escapes not punishment. The delinquent is tortured with remorse: he even desires to be punished; sometimes so ardently, as himself to be the executioner. There cannot be imagined a contrivance more effectual, to deter one from vice; for remorse is itself a grievous punishment. Self-punishment goes still farther: every criminal, sensible that he ought to be punished, dreads punishment from others; and this dread, however smothered during prosperity, breaks out in adversity, or in depression of mind: his crime stares him in the face, and every accidental misfortune is in his disturbed imagination interpreted to be a punishment: "And they said one to another, We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us; and we would not hear: therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben answered them, saying, Spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child; and ye would not hear? therefore behold also his blood is required (a) " *.

No

(a) Genesis xlii. 21.

* John Duke of Britany, commonly termed *the Good Duke*, illustrious for generosity, clemency, and piety, reigned forty-three years, wholly employ'd about the good of his subjects. He was succeeded by his eldest son Francis, a prince weak and suspicious, and consequently fit to be governed. Arthur of Montauban, in love with the wife of Gilles, brother to the Duke, persuaded the Duke that his brother was laying plots to dethrone him. Gilles being imprisoned, the Duke's best friends conjured him to pity his unhappy brother, who might be imprudent, but assuredly was innocent; but in vain. Gilles being prosecuted before the three estates of the province for high treason, was unanimously absolved; which irritated the Duke more and more. Arthur of Montauban artfully suggested to his master to try poison; which having miscarried, they next resolved to starve the prisoner to death. The unfortunate prince, through the bars of a window, cried aloud for bread; but the passengers durst not supply him. One poor woman only had courage more than once to slip some bread within the window. He charged

No transgression of self-duty escapes punishment, more than transgression of duty to others. The punishments, tho' not the same, differ in degree more than in kind. Injustice is punished with remorse: impropriety with shame, which is remorse in a lower degree. Injustice raises indignation in the beholder, and so doth every flagrant impropriety: slighter improprieties receive a milder punishment, being rebuked with some degree of contempt, and commonly with derision (*a*).

So far we have been led in a beaten track; but in attempting to proceed, we are entangled in mazes and intricacies. An action well intended, may happen to produce no good; and an action ill intended, may happen to produce no mischief: a man overawed by fear, may be led to do mischief against his will; and a person, mistaking the standard of right and wrong, may be innocently led to do acts of injustice. By what rule, in such cases, are rewards and punishments to be apply'd? Ought a man to be rewarded when he does no good, or punished when he does no mischief: ought he to be punished for doing mischief against his will,

a priest, who had received his confession, to declare to the Duke, "That seeing justice was refused him in this world, he appealed to Heaven, and called upon the Duke to appear before the judgement-seat of God in forty days." The Duke, and his favourite, amazed that the prince lived so long without nourishment, employ'd assassins to smother him with his bed-cloaths. The priest, in obedience to the orders he had received, presented himself before the Duke, and with a loud voice cited him in name of the deceased Lord Gilles to appear before God in forty days. Shame and remorse verified the prediction. The Duke was seized with a sudden terror, and the image of his brother, expiring by his orders, haunted him day and night. He decay'd daily without any marks of a regular disease, and died within the forty days in frightful agony.

See this subject further illustrated in the *Sketch Principles and Progress of Theology*, chap. I.

(*a*) See *Elements of Criticism*, chap. 10.

or for doing mischief when he thinks he is acting innocently? These questions suggest a doubt, whether the standard of right and wrong be applicable to rewards and punishments.

We have seen that there is an invariable standard of right and wrong, which depends not in any degree on private opinion or conviction. By that standard, all pecuniary claims are judged, all claims of property, and, in a word, every demand founded on interest, not excepting reparation, as will afterward appear. But with respect to the moral characters of men, and with respect to rewards and punishments, a different standard is erected in the common sense of mankind, neither rigid nor inflexible; which is, the opinion that men have of their own actions. It is mentioned above, that a man is esteemed innocent in doing what he himself thinks right, and guilty in doing what he himself thinks wrong. In applying this standard to rewards and punishments, we reward those who in doing wrong are however convinced that they are innocent; and punish those who in doing right are however convinced that they are guilty *. Some, it is true, are so perverted by bad education, or by superstition, as to espouse numberless absurd tenets, contradictory to the standard of right and wrong; and yet such men are no exception from the general rule: if they act according to conscience, they are innocent, and safe against punishment, however wrong the action may be; and if they act against conscience, they are guilty and punishable, however right the action may be: it is abhorrent to every moral perception, that a guilty person be rewarded, or an innocent person punished. Further, if mischief be done contrary to Will, as where a man is

* Virtuous and vicious, innocent and guilty, signify qualities both of men and of their actions. Approbation and disapprobation, praise and blame, signify certain emotions or sentiments of those who see or contemplate men and their actions.

compelled

compelled by fear, or by torture, to reveal the secrets of his party; he may be grieved for yielding to the weakness of his nature, contrary to his firmest resolves; but he has no check of conscience, and upon that account is not liable to punishment. And, lastly, in order that personal merit and demerit may not in any measure depend on chance, we are so constituted as to place innocence and guilt, not on the event, but on the intention of doing right or wrong; and accordingly, whatever be the event, a man is praised for an action well intended, and condemned for an action ill intended.

But what if a man intending a certain wrong, happen by accident to do a wrong he did not intend; as, for example, intending to rob a warren by shooting the rabbits, he accidentally wounds a child unseen behind a bush? The delinquent ought to be punished for intending to rob; and he is also subjected to repair the hurt done to the child: but he cannot be punished for the accidental wound, because our nature regulates punishment by the intention, and not by the event *.

* During the infancy of nations, pecuniary compositions for crimes were universal; and during that long period, very little weight was laid upon intention. This proceeded from the cloudiness and obscurity of moral perceptions among barbarians, joined with the resemblance of pecuniary punishment to reparation.

Where a man does mischief intentionally, or is *versans in illicitis*, as expressed in the Roman law, he is justly bound to repair all the harm that ensues, however accidentally; and from the resemblance of pecuniary punishment to reparation, the rule was childishly extended to punishment. But this rule, so little consistent

with moral principles, could not long subsist after pecuniary compositions gave place to corporal punishment; and accordingly, among civilized nations, the law of nature is restored, which prohibits punishment for any mischief that is not intentional. The English must be excepted, who, remarkably tenacious of their original laws and customs, preserve in force, even as to capital punishment, the above-mentioned rule that obtained among barbarians, when pecuniary compositions

A crime against any primary virtue is attended with severe and never-failing punishment; more efficacious than any that have been invented to enforce municipal laws: on the other hand, the preserving primary virtues inviolate, is attended with little merit. The secondary virtues are directly opposite: the neglecting them is not attended with any punishment; but the practice of them is attended with illustrious rewards. Offices of undeserved kindness, returns of good for ill, generous toils and sufferings for our friends or for our country, are attended with consciousness of self-merit, and with universal praise and admiration; the highest rewards human nature is susceptible of.

From what is said, the following observation will occur: The pain of transgressing justice, fidelity, or any duty, is much greater than the pleasure of performing; but the pain of neglecting a generous action, or any secondary virtue, is as nothing, compared with the pleasure of performing. Among the vices opposite to the primary virtues, the most striking moral deformity is found; among the secondary virtues, the most striking moral beauty.

tions were in vigour. The following passage is from Hales (Pleas of the Crown, chap. 39.) "Regularly he that voluntarily and knowingly intends hurt to the person of a man, as for example to beat him, tho' he intend not death, yet if death ensues, it excuseth not from the guilt of murder, or manslaughter at least, as the circumstances of the case happen." And Foster, in his Crown-law, teaches the same doctrine, never once suspecting in it the least deviation from moral principles. "A shooteth at the poultry of B, and by accident killeth a man: if his intention was to steal the poultry, which must be collected from circumstances, it will be murder by reason of that felonious intent; but if it was done wantonly, and without that intention, it will be barely manslaughter." (p. 259.)

S E C T.

S E C T. VI.

Laws respecting REPARATION.

THE principle of reparation is made a branch of the moral system for accomplishing two ends: which are, to repress wrongs that are not criminal, and to make up the loss sustained by wrongs of whatever kind. With respect to the former, reparation is a species of punishment: with respect to the latter, it is an act of justice. These ends will be better understood, after ascertaining the nature and foundation of reparation; to which the following division of actions is necessary. First, actions that we are bound to perform. Second, actions that we perform in prosecution of a right or privilege. Third, indifferent actions, described above. Actions of the first kind subject not a man to reparation, whatever damage ensues; because it is his duty to perform them, and it would be inconsistent with morality that a man should be subjected to reparation for doing his duty. The laws of reparation that concern actions of the second kind, are more complex. The social state, highly beneficial by affording opportunity for mutual good offices, is attended with some inconveniencies; as where a person happens to be in a situation of necessarily harming others by exercising a right or privilege. If the foresight of harming another, restrain me not from exercising my right, the interest of that other is made subservient to mine: on the other hand, if such foresight restrain me from exercising my right, my interest is made subservient to his. What doth the moral sense provide in
that

that case? To preserve as far as possible an equality among persons born free, and by nature equal in rank, the moral sense lays down a rule, no less beautiful than salutary; which is, That the exercising a right will not justify me for doing direct mischief; but will justify me, tho' I foresee that mischief may possibly happen. The first branch of the rule resolves into a proposition established above, viz. That no interest of mine, not even life itself, will authorise me to hurt an innocent person. The other branch is supported by expediency: for if the bare possibility of hurting others were sufficient to restrain a man from prosecuting his rights and privileges, men would be too much cramped in action; or rather would be reduced to a state of absolute inactivity. With respect to the first branch, I am criminal, and liable even to punishment: with respect to the other, I am not even culpable, nor bound to repair the mischief that happens to ensue.

With respect to the third kind, viz. indifferent actions, the moral sense dictates, that we ought carefully to avoid doing mischief, either direct or consequential. As we suffer no loss by forbearing actions that are done for pastime merely, such an action is *culpable* or *faulty*, if the consequent mischief was foreseen or might have been foreseen; and the actor of course is subjected to reparation. As this is a cardinal point in the doctrine of reparation, I shall endeavour to explain it more fully. Without intending any harm, a man may foresee, that what he is about to do will probably or possibly produce mischief; and sometimes mischief follows that was neither intended nor foreseen. The action in the former case is not criminal; because ill intention is essential to a crime: but it is culpable or faulty; and if mischief ensue, the actor blames himself, and is blamed by others, for having done what he ought not to have done. Thus, a man who throws a large stone among a crowd of people, is highly culpable; because he must foresee that mischief will probably ensue, tho' he has no

intention

intention to hurt any person. As to the latter case, tho' mischief was neither intended nor foreseen, yet if it might have been foreseen, the action is rash or uncautious, and consequently culpable or faulty in some degree. Thus, if a man in pulling down an old house, happen to wound one passing accidentally, without calling aloud to keep out of the way, the action is in some degree culpable, because the mischief might have been foreseen. But tho' mischief ensue, an action is not culpable or faulty if all reasonable precaution have been adhibited: the moral sense declares the author to be innocent * and blameless: the mischief is accidental, and the action may be termed *unlucky*, but comes not under the denomination of either right or wrong. In general, when we act merely for amusement, our nature makes us answerable for the harm that ensues, if it was either foreseen or might with due attention have been foreseen. But our rights and privileges would profit us little, if their exercise were put under the same restraint: it is more wisely ordered, that the probability of mischief, even foreseen, should not restrain a man from prosecuting his concerns, which may often be of consequence to him. He proceeds accordingly with a safe conscience, and is not afraid of being blamed either by God or man.

With respect to rash or uncautious actions, where the mischief might have been foreseen tho' not actually foreseen, it is not sufficient to escape blame, that a man, naturally rash or inattentive, acts according to his character: a degree of precaution is required, both by himself and by others, such as is natural to the generality of men: he perceives that he might and *ought* to have acted more cautiously; and his conscience reproaches him for his inattention,

* *Innocent* here is opposed to *culpable*: in a broader sense, it is opposed to *criminal*. With respect to punishment, an action tho' culpable is innocent, if it be not criminal: with respect to reparation, it is not innocent if it be culpable.

no less than if he were naturally more sedate and attentive. Thus the circumspection natural to mankind in general, is applied as a standard to every individual; and if they fall short of that standard, they are culpable and blameable, however unforeseen by them the mischief may have been.

What is said upon culpable actions, is equally applicable to culpable omissions; for by these also mischief may be occasioned, entitling the sufferer to reparation. If we forbear to do our duty with an intention to occasion mischief, the forbearance is criminal. The only question is, how far forbearance without such intention is culpable. Supposing the probability of mischief to have been foreseen, tho' not intended, the omission is highly culpable; and tho' neither intended nor foreseen, yet the omission is culpable in a lower degree, if there have been less care and attention than are proper for performing the duty required. But supposing all due care, the omission of extreme care and diligence is not culpable.

By ascertaining what acts and omissions are culpable or faulty, the doctrine of reparation is rendered extremely simple; for it may be laid down as a rule without a single exception, That every culpable act, and every culpable omission, binds us in conscience to repair the mischief occasioned by it. The moral sense binds us no farther; for it loads not with reparation the man who is blameless and innocent: the harm is accidental; and we are so constituted as not to be responsible in conscience for what happens by accident. But here it is requisite, that the man be in every respect innocent; for if he intend harm, tho' not what he has done, he will find himself bound in conscience to repair the accidental harm he has done; as, for example, when aiming a blow unjustly at one in the dark, he happens to wound another whom he did not suspect to be there. And hence it is a rule in all municipal laws, That one *versans in illicito* is liable to repair every consequent

sequent damage. That these particulars are wisely ordered by the Author of our nature for the good of society, will appear afterward (a). In general, the rules above mentioned are dictated by the moral sense; and we are compelled to obey them by the principle of reparation.

We are now prepared for a more particular inspection of the two ends of reparation above mentioned, viz. the repressing wrongs that are not criminal, and the making up what loss is sustained by wrongs of whatever kind. With respect to the first, it is clear, that punishment, in its proper sense, cannot be inflicted for a wrong that is culpable only; and if nature did not provide some means for repressing such wrongs, society would scarce be a comfortable state. Laying conscience aside, pecuniary reparation is the only remedy that can be provided against culpable omissions: and with respect to culpable commissions, the necessity of reparation is still more apparent; for conscience alone, without the sanction of reparation, would seldom have authority sufficient to restrain us from acting rashly or uncautiously, even where the possibility of mischief is foreseen, and far less where it is not foreseen.

With respect to the second end of reparation, my conscience dictates to me, that if a man suffer by my fault, whether the mischief was foreseen or not foreseen, it is my duty to make up his loss; and I perceive intuitively, that the loss ought to rest ultimately upon me, and not upon the sufferer, who has not been culpable in any degree.

In every case where the mischief done can be estimated by a pecuniary compensation, the two ends of reparation coincide. The sum is taken from the one as a sort of punishment for his fault,

(a) See. 7.

and is bestow'd on the other to make up the loss he has sustained. But in numberless cases where mischief done cannot be compensated with money, reparation is in its nature a sort of punishment. Defamation, contemptuous treatment, personal restraint, the breaking one's peace of mind, are injuries that cannot be repaired by money; and the pecuniary reparation decreed against the wrong-doer, can only be a sort of punishment, in order to deter him from reiterating such injuries: the sum, it is true, is awarded to the person injured; but not as sufficient to make up his loss, which money cannot do, but only as a *solatium* for what he has suffered.

Hitherto it is supposed, that the man who intends a wrong action, is, at the same time, conscious of its being so. But a man may intend a wrong action, thinking erroneously that it is right; or a right action, thinking erroneously that it is wrong; and the question is, What shall be the consequence of such errors with respect to reparation. The latter case is clear: the person who occasionally suffers loss by a right action, has not a claim for reparation, because he has no just cause of complaint. On the other hand, if the action be wrong, the innocence of the author, for which he is indebted to an error in judgement, will not relieve him from reparation. When he is made sensible of his error, he feels himself bound in conscience to repair the harm he has done by a wrong action: and others, sensible of his error from the beginning, have the same feeling: nor will his obstinacy in resisting conviction, or his dullness in not apprehending his error, mend the matter: it is well that these defects relieve him from punishment, without wronging others by denying a claim for reparation. A man's errors ought to affect himself only, and not those who have not erred. Hence in general, reparation always follows wrong; and is not affected by any erroneous opinion of a wrong action being right, more than of a right action being wrong.

But

But this doctrine suffers an exception with respect to a man, who, having undertaken a trust, is bound in duty to act. A judge is in that situation: it is his duty to pronounce sentence in every case that comes before him; and if he judge according to the best of his knowledge, he is not liable for consequences. A judge cannot be subjected to reparation, unless it can be verified, that the judgement he gave was intentionally wrong. An officer of the revenue is in the same predicament. Led by a doubtful clause in a statute, he makes a seizure of goods as forfeited to the crown, which afterward, in the proper court, are found not to be seizable. The officer ought not to be subjected to reparation, if he have acted to the best of his judgement. This rule however must be taken with a limitation: a public officer who is grossly erroneous, will not be excused; for he ought to know better.

Reparation is due, tho' the immediate act be involuntary, provided it be connected with a preceding voluntary act. Example: "If A ride an unruly horse in Lincolns-inn fields, to tame him, and the horse breaking from A, run over B and grievously hurt him; B shall have an action against A: for tho' the mischief was done against the will of A, yet since it was his fault to bring a wild horse into a frequented place, where mischief might ensue, he must answer for the consequences." Gaius seems to carry this rule still farther, holding in general, that if a horse, by the weakness or unskilfulness of the rider, break away and do mischief, the rider is liable (a). But Gaius probably had in his eye a frequented place, where the mischief might have been foreseen. Thus in general a man is made liable for the mischief occasioned by his voluntary deed, tho' the immediate act that occasioned the mischief be involuntary.

(a) l. 8. § 1. ad leg. Aquil.

S E C T. VII.

FINAL CAUSES of the foregoing Laws of Nature.

Several final causes have been occasionally mentioned in preceding parts of this essay, which could not conveniently be reserved for the present section, being necessary for explaining the subjects to which they relate, the final cause for instance of erecting a standard of morals upon the common sense of mankind. I proceed now to what have not been mentioned, or but slightly mentioned.

The final cause that presents itself first to view, respects man considered as an accountable being. The sense of being accountable, is one of our most vigilant guards against the silent attacks of vice. When a temptation moves me, it immediately occurs, What will the world say? I imagine my friends expostulating, my enemies reviling — I dare not dissemble — my spirits sink — the temptation vanishes. 2dly, Praise and blame, especially from those we regard, are strong incentives to virtue: but if we were not accountable for our conduct, praise and blame would be seldom well directed; for how shall a man's intentions be known, without calling him to account? And praise or blame, frequently ill-directed, would lose their influence. 3dly, This branch of our nature, is the corner-stone of the criminal law. Did not a man think himself accountable to all the world, and to his judge in a peculiar manner, it would be natural for him to think, that the justest sentence pronounced against him, is oppression, not justice.

stice. 4thly, This branch is a strong cement to society. If we were not accountable beings, those connected by blood, or by country, would be no less shy and reserved, than if they were mere strangers to each other.

The final cause that next occurs, being simple and obvious, is mentioned only that it may not seem to have been overlooked. All right actions are agreeable, all wrong actions disagreeable. This is a wise appointment of Providence. We meet with so many temptations against duty, that it is not always an easy task to persevere in the right path: would we persevere, were duty disagreeable? And were acts of pure benevolence disagreeable, they would be extremely rare, however worthy of praise.

Another final cause respects duty, in contradistinction to pure benevolence. All the moral laws are founded on intuitive perception; and are so simple and plain, as to be perfectly apprehended by the most ignorant. Were they in any degree complex or obscure, they would be perverted by selfishness and prejudice. No conviction inferior to what is afforded by intuitive perception, could produce in mankind a common sense with respect to moral duties. Reason would afford no general conviction; because that faculty is distributed in portions so unequal, as to bar all hopes from it of uniformity either in practice or in opinion. At the same time, we are taught by woful experience, that reason has little influence over the greater part of men. Reason, it is true, aided by experience, supports morality, by convincing us, that we cannot be happy if we abandon duty for any other interest. But conviction seldom weighs much against imperious passion; to control which the vigorous and commanding principle of duty is requisite, directed by the shining light of intuition.

A proposition laid down above appears to be a sort of mystery in the moral system, viz. That tho' evidently all moral duties are contrived for promoting the general good, yet that choice is not permitted

permitted among different goods, or between good and ill; and that we are strictly tied down to perform or forbear certain particular acts, without regard to consequences; or, in other words, that we must not do wrong, whatever good it may produce. The final cause, which I am about to unfold, will clear this mystery, and set the beauty of the moral system in a conspicuous light. I begin with observing, that as the general good of mankind, or even of the society we live in, results from many and various circumstances intricately combined, it is far above the capacity of man, to judge in every instance what particular actions will tend the most to that end. The authorising therefore a man to trace out his duty, by weighing endless circumstances good and ill, would open a wide door to partiality and passion, and often lead him unwittingly to prefer the preponderating ill, under a false appearance of being the greater good. At that rate, the opinions of men about right and wrong, would be as various as their faces; which, as observed above, would totally unhinge society. It is better ordered by Providence, even for the general good, that, avoiding complex and obscure objects, we are directed by the moral sense to perform certain plain and simple acts, which are obvious to us by intuitive perception.

In the next place, To permit ill in order to produce greater good, may suit a being of universal benevolence; but is repugnant to the nature of man, composed of selfish and benevolent principles. We have seen above, that the true moral balance depends on a subordination of self-love to duty, and of arbitrary benevolence to self-love; and accordingly every man is sensible of injustice when he is hurt in order to benefit another. Were it a rule in society, That a greater good to any other would make it an act of justice to deprive me of my life, of my reputation, or of my property, I should renounce the society of men, and associate with more harmless animals.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, The true moral system, that which is display'd above, is not only better suited to the nature of man, and to his limited capacity and intelligence, but contributes more to the general good, which I now proceed to demonstrate. It would be losing time to prove, that a man entirely selfish is ill fitted for society; and we have seen (a), that universal benevolence, were it a duty, would contribute to the general good perhaps less than absolute selfishness. Man is too limited in capacity and in power for universal benevolence. Even the greatest monarch has not power to exercise his benevolence but within a very small compass; and if so, how unfit would such a duty be for private persons, who have very little power? Serving only to distress them by inability of performance, they would endeavour to smother it altogether, and give full scope to selfishness. Man is much better qualified for doing good, by a constitution in which benevolence is duly blended with self-love. Benevolence, as a duty, takes place of self-love; a regulation essential to society. Benevolence, as a virtue, not a duty, gives place to self-love; because as every man has more power, knowledge, and opportunity, to promote his own good than that of others, a greater quantity of good is produced, than if benevolence were our only principle of action. This holds, even supposing no harm done to any person: much more would it hold, were we permitted to hurt some, in order to produce more good to others.

The foregoing final causes respect morality in general. We now proceed to particulars; and the first and most important is the law of restraint. Man is evidently framed for society: and as there can be no society among creatures who prey upon each other, it was necessary to provide against mutual injuries; which is effectually done by this law. Its necessity with respect to per-

(a) Sect. 4.

permitted among different goods, or between good and ill; and that we are strictly tied down to perform or forbear certain particular acts, without regard to consequences; or, in other words, that we must not do wrong, whatever good it may produce. The final cause, which I am about to unfold, will clear this mystery, and set the beauty of the moral system in a conspicuous light. I begin with observing, that as the general good of mankind, or even of the society we live in, results from many and various circumstances intricately combined, it is far above the capacity of man, to judge in every instance what particular actions will tend the most to that end. The authorising therefore a man to trace out his duty, by weighing endless circumstances good and ill, would open a wide door to partiality and passion, and often lead him unwittingly to prefer the preponderating ill, under a false appearance of being the greater good. At that rate, the opinions of men about right and wrong, would be as various as their faces; which, as observed above, would totally unhinge society. It is better ordered by Providence, even for the general good, that, avoiding complex and obscure objects, we are directed by the moral sense to perform certain plain and simple acts, which are obvious to us by intuitive perception.

In the next place, To permit ill in order to produce greater good, may suit a being of universal benevolence; but is repugnant to the nature of man, composed of selfish and benevolent principles. We have seen above, that the true moral balance depends on a subordination of self-love to duty, and of arbitrary benevolence to self-love; and accordingly every man is sensible of injustice when he is hurt in order to benefit another. Were it a rule in society, That a greater good to any other would make it an act of justice to deprive me of my life, of my reputation, or of my property, I should renounce the society of men, and associate with more harmless animals.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, The true moral system, that which is display'd above, is not only better suited to the nature of man, and to his limited capacity and intelligence, but contributes more to the general good, which I now proceed to demonstrate. It would be losing time to prove, that a man entirely selfish is ill fitted for society; and we have seen (a), that universal benevolence, were it a duty, would contribute to the general good perhaps less than absolute selfishness. Man is too limited in capacity and in power for universal benevolence. Even the greatest monarch has not power to exercise his benevolence but within a very small compass; and if so, how unfit would such a duty be for private persons, who have very little power? Serving only to distress them by inability of performance, they would endeavour to smother it altogether, and give full scope to selfishness. Man is much better qualified for doing good, by a constitution in which benevolence is duly blended with self-love. Benevolence, as a duty, takes place of self-love; a regulation essential to society. Benevolence, as a virtue, not a duty, gives place to self-love; because as every man has more power, knowledge, and opportunity, to promote his own good than that of others, a greater quantity of good is produced, than if benevolence were our only principle of action. This holds, even supposing no harm done to any person: much more would it hold, were we permitted to hurt some, in order to produce more good to others.

The foregoing final causes respect morality in general. We now proceed to particulars; and the first and most important is the law of restraint. Man is evidently framed for society: and as there can be no society among creatures who prey upon each other, it was necessary to provide against mutual injuries; which is effectually done by this law. Its necessity with respect to per-

(a) Sect. 4.

nal security is self-evident; and with respect to property, its necessity will appear from what follows. In the nature of every man, there is a propensity to hoard or store up things useful to himself and family. But this natural propensity would be rendered ineffectual, were he not secured in the possession of what he thus stores up; for no man will toil to accumulate what he cannot securely possess. This security is afforded by the moral sense, which dictates, that the first occupant of goods provided by nature for the subsistence of man, ought to be secure in his possession, and that such goods ought to be inviolable as his property. Thus, by the great law of restraint, men have a protection for their goods, as well as for their persons; and are no less secure in society, than if they were separated from each other by impregnable walls.

Several other duties are little less essential than of restraint to the existence of society. Mutual trust and confidence, without which society would be an uncomfortable state, enter into the character of the human species; to which the duties of veracity and fidelity correspond. The final cause of these corresponding duties, is obvious: the latter would be of no use in society without the former; and the former, without the latter, would be hurtful, by laying men open to fraud and deceit.

With respect to veracity in particular, man is so constituted, that he must be indebted to information for the knowledge of most things that benefit or hurt him; and if he could not depend upon information, society would be very little beneficial. Further, it is wisely ordered, that we should be bound by the moral sense always to speak truth, even where we perceive no harm in transgressing that duty; because it is sufficient that harm may ensue, tho' not foreseen. At the same time, falsehood always does mischief: it may happen not to injure us externally in our reputation, or in our goods: but it never fails to injure us internally; for one great blessing of society is, a candid intercourse of sentiments,

ments, of opinions, of desires, and wishes; and to admit any falsehood in such intercourse, would poison the most refined pleasures of life.

Because man is the weakest of all animals in a state of separation; and the very strongest in society, by mutual aid and support to which covenants and promises greatly contribute, these are made binding by the moral sense.

The final cause of the law of propriety, which enforces the duty we owe to ourselves, comes next in order. In discoursing upon those laws of nature which concern society, there is no occasion to mention any self-duty but what relates to society; of which kind are prudence, temperance, industry, firmness of mind. And that such qualities should be made our duty, is wisely ordered in a double respect; first, as qualifying us to act a proper part in society, and next, as intitling us to good-will from others. It is the interest, no doubt, of every man, to suit his behaviour to the dignity of his nature, and to the station allotted him by Providence; for such rational conduct contributes to happiness, by preserving health, procuring plenty, gaining the esteem of others, and, which of all is the greatest blessing, by gaining a justly-founded self-esteem. But here interest solely is not relied on; the powerful authority of duty is added, that in a matter of the utmost importance to ourselves, and of some importance to the society we live in, our conduct may be regular and steady. These duties tend not only to render a man happy in himself, but also, by procuring the good-will and esteem of others, to command their aid and assistance in time of need.

I proceed to the final causes of natural rewards and punishments. It is laid down above, that controversies about property and about other matters of interest, must be adjusted by the standard of right and wrong. But to bring rewards and punishments under the same standard, without regard to private conscience,

would be a plan unworthy of our Maker. It is extremely clear, that to reward one who is not conscious of merit, or to punish one who is not conscious of guilt, cannot answer any good end; and in particular, cannot tend either to improvement or to reformation of manners. How much more like the Deity is the plan of nature, which rewards no man who is not conscious that he merits reward, and punishes no man who is not conscious that he merits punishment! By that plan, and by that only, rewards and punishments accomplish every good end; a final cause most illustrious! The rewards and punishments that attend the primary and secondary virtues, are finely contrived for supporting the distinction between them, set forth above. Punishment must be confined to the transgression of primary virtues, it being the intention of nature, that secondary virtues be entirely free. On the other hand, secondary virtues are more highly rewarded than primary: generosity, for example, makes a greater figure than justice; and magnanimity, heroism, undaunted courage, a still greater figure. One would imagine, at first view, that primary virtues, being more essential, should be intitled to the first place in our esteem, and be more amply rewarded than secondary; and yet in elevating the latter above the former, peculiar wisdom and foresight are conspicuous. Punishment is appropriated to enforce primary virtues; and if these virtues were also attended with high rewards, secondary virtues, degraded to a lower rank, would be deprived of that enthusiastic admiration which is their chief support: self-interest would universally prevail over benevolence, and banish those numberless favours we receive from each other in society, which are beneficial in point of interest, and still more so by generating affection and friendship.

In our progress through final causes we come at last to reparation, one of the principles destined by Providence for redressing wrongs committed, and for preventing the reiteration of them.

The

The final cause of this principle, when the mischief arises from intention, is clear: for to protect individuals in society, it is not sufficient that the delinquent be punished; it is necessary over and above, that the mischief be repaired.

Secondly, Where the act is wrong or unjust, tho' not understood by the author to be so, it is wisely ordered that reparation should follow; which will thus appear. Considering the fallibility of man, it would be too severe to permit advantage to be taken of one's error in every circumstance. On the other hand, to make it a law in our nature, never to take advantage of error, would be giving too much indulgence to indolence and remission of mind, tending to make us neglect the improvement of our rational faculties. Our nature is so happily framed, as to avoid these extremes by distinguishing between gain and loss. No man is conscious of wrong, when he takes advantage of an error committed by another to save himself from loss: if there must be a loss, common sense dictates, that it ought to rest upon the person who has erred, however innocently, rather than upon the person who has not erred. Thus, in a competition among creditors about the estate of their bankrupt debtor, every one is at liberty to avail himself of every error committed by his competitor, in order to recover payment. But *in lucro captando*, the moral sense teacheth a different lesson; which is, that no man ought to lay hold of another's error to make gain by it. Thus, an heir finding a rough diamond in the repositories of his ancestor, gives it away, mistaking it for a common pebble: the purchaser is in conscience and equity bound to restore, or to pay a just price.

Thirdly, The following considerations unfold a final cause, no less beautiful than that last mentioned. Society could not subsist in any tolerable manner, were full scope given to rashness and negligence; and to every action that is not strictly criminal; whence

whence it is a maxim founded no less upon utility than upon justice, That men in society ought to be extremely circumspect, as to every action that may possibly do harm. On the other hand, it is also a maxim, That as the prosperity and happiness of man depend on action, activity ought to be encouraged, instead of being discouraged by dread of consequences. These maxims, seemingly in opposition, have natural limits that prevent their encroaching upon each other. There is a certain degree of attention and circumspection that men generally bestow upon affairs, proportioned to their importance: if that degree were not sufficient to defend against a claim of reparation, individuals would be too much cramped in action; which would be a great discouragement to activity: if a less degree were sufficient, there would be too great scope for rash or remiss conduct; which would prove the bane of society. These limits, which evidently tend to the good of society, are adjusted by the moral sense; which dictates, as laid down in the section of Reparation, that the man who acts with foresight of the probability of mischief, or acts rashly and uncautiously without such foresight, ought to be liable for consequences; but that the man who acts cautiously, without foreseeing or suspecting any mischief, ought not to be liable for consequences.

In the same section it is laid down, that the moral sense requires from every man, not his own degree of vigilance and attention, which may be very small, but that which belongs to the common nature of the species. The final cause of that regulation will appear upon considering, that were reparation to depend upon personal circumstances, there would be a necessity of enquiring into the characters of men, their education, their manner of living, and the extent of their understanding; which would render judges arbitrary, and such law-suits inextricable. But by assuming the

the common nature of the species as a standard, by which every man in conscience judges of his own actions, law-suits about reparation are rendered easy and expeditious.

S E C T. VIII.

LIBERTY and NECESSITY *considered with respect to Morality.*

HAVING, in the foregoing sections, ascertained the reality of a moral sense, with its sentiments of approbation and disapprobation, praise and blame; the purpose of the present section is, to shew, that these sentiments are consistent with the laws that govern the actions of man as a rational being. In order to which, it is first necessary to explain these laws; for there has been much controversy about them, especially among divines of the Arminian and Calvinist sects.

Human actions, as laid down in the first section, are of three kinds: one, where we act by instinct, without any view to consequences; one, where we act by will in order to produce some effect; and one, where we act against will. With respect to the first, the agent acts blindly, without deliberation or choice; and the external act follows necessarily from the instinctive impulse *. Ac-

* A Stonechatter makes its nest on the ground or near it; and the young, as soon as they can shift for themselves, leave the nest instinctively. An egg of that bird

tions done with a view to an end, are in a very different condition: in these, deliberation, choice, will, enter: the intention to accomplish the end goes first; the will to act in order to accomplish the end is next; and the external act follows of course. It is the will then that governs every action done as means to an end; and it is desire to accomplish the end that puts the will in motion; desire in this view being commonly termed the *motive* to act. Thus, hearing that my friend is in the hands of robbers, I burn with desire to free him: desire influences my will to arm my servants, and to fly to his relief. Actions done against will come in afterward.

But what is it that raises desire? The answer is at hand: it is the prospect of attaining some agreeable end, or of avoiding one that is disagreeable. And if it be again enquired, What makes an object agreeable or disagreeable, the answer is equally ready, that our nature makes it so; and more we cannot say. Certain visible objects are agreeable, certain sounds, and certain smells: other objects of these senses are disagreeable. But there we must stop; for we are far from being so intimately acquainted with our own nature as to assign the causes. These hints are sufficient for my present purpose: if one be curious to know more, the

bird was laid in a swallow's nest, fixed to the roof of a church. The swallow fed all the young equally without distinction. The young stonechatter left the nest at the usual time before it could fly; and falling to the ground, it was taken up dead. Here is instinct in purity, exerting itself blindly without regard to variation of circumstances. The same is observable in our dunghill-fowl. They feed on worms, corn, and other feeds dropt on the ground. In order to discover their food, nature has provided them with an instinct to scrape with one foot; and the instinct is so regularly exercised, that they scrape even when they are set upon a heap of corn.

theory

theory of desire, and of agreeableness and disagreeableness, will be found in Elements of Criticism (a).

With respect to instinctive actions, no person, I presume, thinks that there is any freedom, more than in acts done against will: an infant applies to the nipple, and a bird builds its nest, no less necessarily than a stone falls to the ground. With respect to voluntary actions, such as are done with a view to an end, the necessity is the same, tho' less apparent at first view. The external action is determined by the will: the will is determined by desire: and desire by what is agreeable or disagreeable. Here is a chain of causes and effects, not one link of which is arbitrary, or under command of the agent: he cannot will but according to his desire: he cannot desire but according to what is agreeable or disagreeable in the objects perceived: nor do these qualities depend on his inclination or fancy; he has no power to make a beautiful woman ugly, nor to make a rotten carcase sweet.

Many good men apprehending danger to morality from holding our actions to be necessary, endeavour to break the chain of causes and effects above mentioned, maintaining, "That whatever influence desire or motives may have, it is the agent himself who is the cause of every action; that desire may advise, but cannot command; and therefore that a man is still free to act in contradiction to desire and to the strongest motives." That a being may exist, which in every case acts blindly and arbitrarily, without having any end in view, I can make a shift to conceive: but it is difficult for me even to imagine a thinking and rational being, that has affections and passions, that has a desirable end in view, that can easily accomplish this end; and yet, after all, can fly off, or remain at rest, without any cause, reason, or motive, to sway it. If such a whimsical being can possibly ex-

(a) Chap. 2.

ist, I am certain that man is not such a being. There is perhaps not a person above the condition of a changeling, but can say why he did so and so, what moved him, what he intended. Nor is a single fact stated to make us believe, that ever a man acted against his own will or desire, who was not compelled by external violence. On the contrary, constant and universal experience proves, that human actions are governed by certain inflexible laws; and that a man cannot exert his self-motive power, but in pursuance of some desire or motive.

Had a motive always the same influence, actions proceeding from it would appear no less necessary than the actions of matter. The various degrees of influence that motives have on different men at the same time, and on the same man at different times, occasion a doubt by suggesting a notion of chance. Some motives however have such influence, as to leave no doubt: a timid female has a physical power to throw herself into the mouth of a lion, roaring for food; but she is withheld by terror no less effectually than by cords: if she should rush upon the lion, would not every one conclude that she was frantic? A man, tho' in a deep sleep, retains a physical power to act, but he cannot exert it. A man, tho' desperately in love, retains a physical power to refuse the hand of his mistress; but he cannot exert that power in contradiction to his own ardent desire, more than if he were fast asleep. Now if a strong motive have a necessary influence, there is no reason for doubting, but that a weak motive must also have its influence, the same in kind, tho' not in degree. Some actions indeed are strangely irregular; but let the wildest action be scrutiniz'd, there will always be discovered some motive or desire, which, however whimsical or capricious, was what influenced the person to act. Of two contending motives is it not natural to expect, that the stronger will prevail, however little its excess may be? If there be any doubt, it must be from a supposition that a weak

weak motive can be resisted arbitrarily. Where then are we to fix the boundary between a weak and a strong motive? If a weak motive can be resisted, why not one a little stronger, and why not the strongest? In *Elements of Criticism* (a) the reader will find many examples of contrary motives weighing against each other. Let him ponder these with the strictest attention: his conclusion will be, that between two motives, however nearly balanced, a man has not an arbitrary choice, but must yield to the stronger. The mind indeed fluctuates for some time, and feels itself in a measure loose: at last, however, it is determined by the more powerful motive, as a balance is by the greater weight after many vibrations.

Such then are the laws that govern our voluntary actions. A man is absolutely free to act according to his own will; greater freedom than which is not conceivable. At the same time, as man is made accountable for his conduct, to his Maker, to his fellow-creatures, and to himself, he is not left to act arbitrarily; for at that rate he would be altogether unaccountable: his will is regulated by desire; and desire by what pleases or displeases him. Where we are subjected to the will of another, would it be our wish, that his will should be under no regulation? And where we are guided by our own will, would it be reasonable to wish, that it should be under no regulation, but be exerted without reason, without any motive, and contrary to common sense? Thus, with regard to human conduct, there is a chain of laws established by nature, not one link of which is left arbitrary. By that wise system, man is rendered accountable: by it, he is made a fit subject for divine and human government: by it, persons of sagacity foresee the conduct of others: and by it, the prescience of the Deity with respect to human actions, is firmly established.

(a) Chap. 2. part 4.

The absurd figure men would make if they could act contrary to motives, should be sufficient, one may think, to open our eyes without an argument. What a despicable figure does a person make, upon whom the same motive has great influence at one time, and very little at another? He is a bad member of society, and cannot be rely'd on as a friend or as an associate. But how highly rational is this supposed person, compared with one who can act in contradiction to every motive? The former may be termed whimsical or capricious: the latter is worse; he is absolutely unaccountable, and cannot be the subject of government, more than a lump of matter unconscious of its own motion.

Let the faculty of acting be compared with that of reasoning: the comparison will tend to soften our reluctance to the necessary influence of motives. A man sometimes blunders in reasoning; but he is tied by his nature, to form conclusions upon what appears to him true at the time. If he could arbitrarily form a different conclusion, what an absurd reasoner would he be! Would a man be less absurd, if he had a power of acting against motives, and contrary to what he thinks right or eligible? To act in that manner, is inconsistent with any notion we can form of a sensible being. Nor do we suppose that man is such a being: in accounting for any action, however whimsical, we always ascribe it to some motive, never once dreaming that there was no motive.

And after all, where would be the advantage of such an arbitrary power? Can a rational man wish seriously to have such a power? or can he seriously think, that God would make man so whimsical a being? To endue man with a degree of self-command sufficient to resist every vicious motive, without any power to resist those that are virtuous, would indeed be a gift of value; but too great for man, because it would exalt him to be an angel. But such self-command as to resist both equally, which is the present supposition, would unqualify us for being governed
either

either by God or by man. Better far to be led as rational creatures by the prospect of good, however erroneous our judgement may sometimes be.

Considering that man is the only terrestrial being formed to know his Maker, and to worship him, will it not sound harshly, while all other animals are subjected to divine government, and unerringly fulfil their destination, that man alone should be withdrawn from divine government, and be so framed, that neither his Maker, nor he himself, can foresee what he will do the next moment? The power of resisting the strongest motives, whether of religion or of morality, would render him independent of the Deity.

This reasoning is too diffuse: may it not be comprehended in a single view? it will make the deeper impression. There may be conceived different systems for governing man as a thinking and rational being. One is, That virtuous motives should always prevail over every other motive. This, in appearance, would be the most perfect government. But man is not so constituted; and there is reason to doubt, whether such perfection would in his present state correspond to the other branches of his nature (a). Another system is, That virtuous motives sometimes prevail, sometimes vitious; and that we are always determined by the prevailing motive. This is the true system of nature; and hence great variety of character and of conduct among men. A third system is, That motives have influence; but that one can act in contradiction to every motive. This is the system I have been combating. Observe only what it resolves into. How is an action to be accounted for that is done in contradiction to every motive? It wanders from the region of common sense into that of mere

(a) See book 2. sketch 1. at the end.

chance. If such were the nature of man, no one could rely on another: a promise or an oath would be a rope of sand: the utmost cordiality between my friend and me, would be no security against his stabbing me with the first weapon that comes in his way. Would any man wish to have been formed according to such a system? He would probably wish to have been formed according to the system first mentioned: but that is deny'd him, virtuous motives sometimes prevailing, sometimes vicious; and from the wisdom of Providence we have reason to believe, that this law is of all the best fitted for man in his present state.

To conclude this branch of the subject: In none of the works of Providence, so far as we can penetrate, is there display'd a deeper reach of art and wisdom, than in the laws of action peculiar to man as a thinking and rational being. Were he left loose, to act in contradiction to motives, there would be no place for prudence, foresight, nor for adjusting means to an end: it could not be foreseen by others what a man will do the next hour; nay it could not be foreseen, even by himself. Man would not be capable of rewards and punishments: he would not be fitted, either for divine or for human government: he would be a creature that has no resemblance to the human race. But man is not left loose; for tho' he is at liberty to act according to his own will, yet his will is regulated by desire, and desire by what pleases and displeases. This connection preserves uniformity of conduct, and confines human actions within the great chain of causes and effects. By this admirable system, liberty and necessity, seemingly incompatible, are made perfectly concordant, fitting us for society, and for government both human and divine.

Having explained the laws that govern human actions, we proceed to what is chiefly intended in the present section, which is, to examine, how far the moral sentiments handled in the foregoing sections are consistent with these laws. Let it be kept in view, that

that our moral sentiments and feelings are founded entirely upon the moral sense; which unfolds to us a right and a wrong in actions. From the same sense are derived the sentiments of approbation and praise when a man does right, and of disapprobation and blame when he does wrong. Were we destitute of the moral sense, right and wrong, praise and blame, would be as little understood as colours are by one born blind*.

The formidable argument that is urged, to prove that our moral sentiments are inconsistent with the supposed necessary influence of motives, is what follows. "If motives have a necessary influence on our actions, there can be no good reason to praise a man for doing right, nor to blame him for doing wrong. What foundation can there be, either for praise or blame, when it was not in a man's power to have acted otherwise. A man commits murder instigated by a sudden fit of revenge: why should he be punished, if he acted necessarily, and could not resist the violence of the passion?" Here it is supposed, that a power of resistance is essential to praise and blame. But upon examination it will be found, that this supposition has not any support in the moral sense, nor in reason, nor in the common sense of mankind.

With respect to the first, the moral sense, as we have seen above, places innocence and guilt, and consequently praise and blame,

* In an intricate subject like the present, great care should be taken to avoid ambiguities. The term *praise* has two different significations: in one sense it is opposed to *blame*; in another, to *dispraise*. In the former sense it expresses a moral sentiment: in the latter, it expresses only the approving any object that pleases me. I praise one man for his candour, and blame another for being a double-dealer. These, both of them, imply will and intention. I praise a man for being acute; but for being dull, I only dispraise him. I praise a woman for beauty; but blame not any for ugliness, I only dispraise them. None of these particulars imply will or intention.

entirely

entirely upon will and intention. The connection between the motive and the action, so far from diminishing, enhances the praise or blame. The greater influence a virtuous motive has, the greater is the virtue of the agent, and the more warm our praise. On the other hand, the greater influence a vicious motive has, the greater is the vice of the agent, and the more violently do we blame him. As this is the cardinal point, I wish to have it considered in a general view. It is essential both to human and divine government, that the influence of motives should be necessary. It is equally essential, that that necessary influence should not have the effect to lessen guilt in the estimation of men. To fulfil both ends, guilt is placed by the moral sense entirely upon will and intention: a man accordingly blames himself for doing mischief willingly and intentionally, without once considering whether he acted necessarily or not. And his sentiments are adopted by all the world: they pronounce the same sentence of condemnation that he himself does. A man put to the torture, yields to the pain, and with bitter reluctance reveals the secrets of his party: another does the same, yielding to a tempting bribe. The latter only is blamed as guilty of a crime; and yet the bribe perhaps operated as strongly on the latter, as torture did on the former. But the one was compelled against his will to reveal the secrets of his party; and therefore is innocent: the other acted willingly, in order to procure a great sum of money; and therefore is guilty.

With respect to reason, I observe, that the argument I am combating is an appeal to a wrong tribunal: the moral sense is the only judge in this controversy, not the faculty of reason. At the same time, I should have no fear of a sentence against me, were reason to be the judge. For would not reason dictate, that the less a man wavers about his duty; or, in other words, the less influence

ence vitious motives have, the more praise-worthy he is ; and the more blameable, the less influence virtuous motives have.

Nor are we led by common sense to differ from reason and the moral sense. A man commits murder, overcome by a sudden fit of revenge which he could not resist ; will not one be led to reflect, even at first view, that the man did not wish to resist ? on the contrary, that he would have committed the murder, tho' he had not been under any necessity ? A person of plain understanding will say, What signifies it whether the criminal could resist or not, when he committed the murder wittingly and willingly ? A man gives poison privately out of revenge. Does any one doubt of his guilt, when he never once repented ; tho' after administering the poison it no longer was in his power to draw back ? A man may be guilty and blame-worthy, even where there is external compulsion that he cannot resist. With sword in hand I run to attack an enemy : my foot slipping, I fall headlong upon him, and by that accident the sword is push'd into his body. The external act was not the effect of Will, but of accident : but my intention was to commit murder, and I am guilty. All men acknowledge, that the Deity is necessarily good. Does that circumstance detract from his praise in common apprehension ? On the contrary, he merits from us the highest praise on that very account.

It is commonly said, that there can be no virtue where there is no struggle. Virtue, it is true, is best known from a struggle : a man who has never met with a temptation, can be little confident of his virtue. But the observation taken in a strict sense, is undoubtedly erroneous. A man, tempted to betray his trust, wavers ; but, after much doubting, refuses at last the bribe. Another hesitates not a moment, but rejects the bribe with disdain : duty is obstinate, and will not suffer him even to deliberate. Is there

there no virtue in the latter? Undoubtedly more than in the former.

Upon the whole, it appears that praise and blame rest ultimately upon the disposition or frame of mind. Nor is it obvious, that a power to act against motives, could vary in any degree these moral sentiments. When a man commits a crime, let it be supposed, that he could have resisted the prevailing motive. Why then did he not resist, instead of bringing upon himself shame and misery? The answer must be, for no other can be given, that his disposition is vicious, and that he is a detestable creature. Further, it is not a little difficult to conceive, how a man can resist a prevailing motive, without having any thing in his mind that should engage him to resist it. But letting that pass, I make the following supposition. A man is tempted by avarice to accept a bribe: if he resist upon the principle of duty, he is led by the prevailing motive: if he resist without having any reason or motive for resisting, I cannot discover any merit in such resistance: it seems to resolve into a matter of chance or accident, whether he resist or do not resist. Where can the merit lie of resisting a vicious motive, when resistance happens by mere chance? and where the demerit of resisting a virtuous motive, when it is owing to the same chance? If a man, actuated by no principle, good or bad, and having no end or purpose in view, should kill his neighbour, I see not that he would be more accountable, than if he had acted in his sleep, or were mad.

Human punishments are perfectly consistent with the necessary influence of motives, without supposing a power to withstand them. If it be urged, That a man ought not to be punished for committing a crime when he could not resist; the answer is, That as he committed the crime intentionally, and with his eyes open, he is guilty in his own opinion, and in the opinion of all men; and he justly suffers punishment, to prevent him or others from
doing

doing the like in time to come. The dread of punishment is a weight in the scale on the side of virtue, to counterbalance vicious motives.

The final cause of this branch of our nature is admirable. If the necessary influence of motives had the effect either to lessen the merit of a virtuous action, or the demerit of a crime, morality would be totally unhinged. The most virtuous action would of all be the least worthy of praise; and the most vicious be of all the least worthy of blame. Nor would the evil stop there: instead of curbing inordinate passions, we should be encouraged to indulge them, as an excellent excuse for doing wrong. Thus, the moral sentiments of approbation and disapprobation, of praise and blame, are found perfectly consistent with the laws above mentioned that govern human actions, without having recourse to an imaginary power of acting against motives.

The only plausible objection I have met with against the foregoing theory, is the remorse a man feels for a crime he suddenly commits, and as suddenly repents of. During a fit of bitter remorse for having slain my favourite servant in a violent passion, without just provocation, I accuse myself for having given way to passion; and acknowledge that I could and ought to have restrained it. Here we find remorse founded on a system directly opposite to that above laid down; a system that acknowledges no necessary connection between an action and the motive that produced it; but, on the contrary, supposes that it is in a man's power to resist his passion, and that he ought to resist it. What shall be said upon this point? Can a man be a necessary agent, when he is conscious of the contrary, and is sensible that he can act in contradiction to motives? This objection is strong in appearance; and would be invincible, were we not happily relieved of it by a doctrine laid down in Elements of Criticism

cism (a) concerning the irregular influence of passion on our opinions and sentiments. Upon examination, it will be found, that the present case may be added to the many examples there given of this irregular influence. In a peevish fit, I take exception at some slight word or gesture of my friend, which I interpret as if he doubted of my veracity. I am instantly in a flame: in vain he protests that he had no meaning, for impatience will not suffer me to listen. I bid him draw, which he does with reluctance; and before he is well prepared, I give him a mortal wound. Bitter remorse and anguish succeed instantly to rage. "What have I done? why did I not abstain? I was not mad, and yet I have murdered my innocent friend: there is the hand that did the horrid deed; why did not I rather turn it against my own heart?" Here every impression of necessity vanishes: my mind tells me that I was absolutely free, and that I ought to have smothered my passion. I put an opposite case. A brutal fellow treats me with great indignity, and proceeds even to a blow. My passion rises beyond the possibility of restraint: I can scarce forbear so long as to bid him draw; and that moment I stab him to the heart. I am sorry for having been engaged with a ruffian, but have no contrition nor remorse. In this case, my sentiments are very different from what they are in the other. I never once dream that I could have resisted the impulse of passion: on the contrary, my thoughts and words are, "That flesh and blood could not bear the affront; and that I must have been branded for a coward, had I not done what I did." In reality, both the actions were equally necessary. Whence then opinions and sentiments so opposite to each other? The irregular influence of passion on our opinions and sentiments, will solve the question. All violent passions are prone to their own gratification. A man affected

(a) Chap. 2. part 5.

with deep remorse abhors himself, and is odious in his own eyes; and it gratifies the passion, to indulge the thought that his guilt is beyond the possibility of excuse. In the first case accordingly, remorse forces upon me a conviction that I might have restrained my passion, and ought to have restrained it. I will not give way to any excuse; because in a fit of remorse it gives me pain to be excused. In the other case, there being no remorse, there is no disguise; and things appear in their true light. To illustrate this reasoning, I observe, that passion warps my judgement of the actions of others, as well as of my own. Many examples are given in the chapter above quoted: join to these the following. My servant aiming at a partridge, happens to shoot a favourite spaniel crossing the way unseen. Inflamed with anger, I storm at his rashness, pronounce him guilty, and will listen to no excuse. When my passion is spent, I become sensible that it was merely accidental, and that the man is absolutely innocent. The nurse overlays my only child, the long-expected heir to a great estate. It is with difficulty that I refrain from putting her to death: "The wretch has murdered my infant, and deserves to be torn to pieces." When my passion subsides, I see the matter in a very different light. The poor woman is inconsolable, and can scarce believe that she is innocent; she bitterly reproaches herself for want of care and concern. But, upon cool reflection, both she and I are sensible, that no person in sound sleep has any self-command; and that we cannot be answerable for any action of which we are not conscious. Thus, upon the whole, we find, that any impression we may occasionally have of being able to act in contradiction to motives, is the result of passion, not of sound judgement.

The reader will observe, that this section is copied from Essays on Morality and Natural Religion. The ground-work is the same: the alterations are only in the superstructure; and the subject is

abridged in order to adapt it to its present place. Part of the abridgement was published in the second edition of the Principles of Equity. But as law-books have little currency, the publishing the whole in one essay, will not, I hope, be thought improper.

A P P E N D I X.

Upon CHANCE and CONTINGENCY.

I Hold it to be an intuitive proposition, That the Deity is the primary cause of all things; that with consummate wisdom he formed the great plan of government, which he carries on by laws suited to the different natures of animate and inanimate beings; and that these laws, produce a regular chain of causes and effects in the moral as well as the material world, admitting no events but what are comprehended in the original plan (a). Hence it clearly follows, that chance is excluded out of this world, that nothing can happen by accident, and that no event is arbitrary or contingent. This is the doctrine of the essay quoted; and, in my apprehension, well founded. But I cannot subscribe to what follows, viz. "That we have an impression of chance and contingency, which consequently must be delusive." I would not willingly admit any delusion in the nature of man, where it is not made evident beyond contradiction; and I now see clearly, that

(a) See Essays on Morality and Natural Religion, part 1. essay 3.

the impression we have of chance and contingency, is not delusive, but perfectly consistent with the established plan; asw
The explanation of chance and contingency in the said essay, shall be given in the author's own words, as a proper text to reason upon. " In our ordinary train of thinking, it is certain
" that all events appear not to us as necessary. A multitude of
" events seem to be under our power to cause or to prevent; and
" we readily make a distinction betwixt events that are *necessary*,
" *i. e.* that must be; and events that are *contingent*, *i. e.* that may
" be, or may not be. This distinction is void of truth: for all
" things that fall out either in the material or moral world, are,
" as we have seen, alike necessary, and alike the result of fixed
" laws. Yet, whatever conviction a philosopher may have of
" this, the distinction betwixt things necessary and things con-
" tingent, possesses his common train of thought, as much as it
" possesses the most illiterate. We act universally upon that dis-
" tinction: nay it is in truth the cause of all the labour, care,
" and industry, of mankind. I illustrate this doctrine by an ex-
" ample. Constant experience hath taught us, that death is a ne-
" cessary event. The human frame is not made to last for ever
" in its present condition; and no man thinks of more than a
" temporary existence upon this globe. But the particular time
" of our death appears a contingent event. However certain it
" be, that the time and manner of the death of each individual
" is determined by a train of preceding causes, and is no less
" fixed than the hour of the sun's rising or setting; yet no person
" is affected by this doctrine. In the care of prolonging life, we
" are directed by the supposed contingency of the time of death,
" which, to a certain term of years, we consider as depending in
" a great measure on ourselves, by caution against accidents,
" due use of food, exercise, &c. These means are prosecuted
" with the same diligence as if there were in fact no necessary
" train

“train of causes to fix the period of life. In short, whoever attends to his own practical ideas, whoever reflects upon the meaning of the following words which occur in all languages, of things *possible, contingent, that are in our power to cause or prevent*; whoever, I say, reflects upon these words, will clearly see, that they suggest certain perceptions or notions repugnant to the doctrine above established of universal necessity.”

In order to show that there is no repugnance, I begin with defining *chance* and *contingency*. The former is applied to events that have happened; the latter to future events. When we say a thing has happened by *chance*, we do not mean that *chance* was the cause; for no person ever thought that *chance* is a thing that can act, and by acting produce events: we only mean, that we are ignorant of the cause, and that, for ought we see, it might have happened or not happened, or have happened differently. Aiming at a bird, I shoot by *chance* a favourite spaniel: the meaning is not, that chance killed the dog, but that as to me the dog's death was accidental. With respect to contingency, future events that are variable, and the cause unknown, are said to be contingent; changes of the weather, for example, whether it will be frost or thaw to-morrow, whether fair or foul. In a word, chance and contingency applied to events, mean not that such events happen without any cause, but only that we are ignorant of the cause.

It appears to me clear, that there is no such thing in human nature as a sense of *contingency*; or, in other words, a sense that any thing happens without a cause: such a sense would be grossly delusive. True it is indeed, that our sense of a cause is but cloudy and indistinct with respect to certain events. Events that happen regularly, such as summer and winter, rising and setting of the sun, give us a distinct impression of a cause. The impression is less distinct with respect to events less regular, such as alterations

terations of the weather ; and extremely indistinct with respect to events that seldom happen, and that happen without any known cause. But with respect to no event whatever does our sense of a cause vanish altogether, and give place to a positive sense of contingency, that is, a sense of things happening without a cause.

Chance and contingency thus explained, suggest not any perception or notion repugnant to the doctrine of universal necessity ; for my ignorance of a cause, does not, even in my own apprehension, exclude a cause. Descending to particulars, I take the example mentioned in the text, viz. the uncertainty of the time of my death. Knowing that my life depends in some measure on myself, I use all means to preserve it, by proper food, exercise, and care to prevent accidents. Nor is there any delusion here. I am moved to use these means by the desire I have to live : these means accordingly prove effectual to carry on my present existence to the appointed period ; and in that view are so many links in the great chain of causes and effects. A burning coal falling from the grate upon the floor, wakes me from a sound sleep. I start up to extinguish the fire. The motive is irresistible : nor have I reason to resist, were it in my power ; for I consider the extinction of the fire by my hand to be one of the means chosen by Providence for prolonging my life to its destined period.

Were there a chain of causes and effects established entirely independent on me, and were my life in no measure under my own power, it would indeed be fruitless for me to act ; and the absurdity of knowingly acting in vain, would be a prevailing motive for remaining at rest. Upon that supposition, the *ignavia ratio* of Chrysippus might take place ; *cui si pareamus, nihil omnino agamus in vita* *. But I act necessarily when influenced by motives ;

* "The indolent principle ; which if we were to follow, we should do nothing in life."

and I have no reason to forbear, considering that my actions, by producing their intended effects, contribute to carry on the universal chain.

PART II.

PROGRESS OF MORALITY.

HAVING unfolded the principles of morality, the next step is, to trace out its gradual progress, from its infancy among savages, to its maturity among polished nations. The history of opinions concerning the foundation of morality, falls not within my plan; and I am glad to be relieved from an article that is executed in perfection by more able hands (a).

An animal is brought forth with every one of its external members; and completes its growth, not by production of any new member, but by addition of matter to those originally formed. The same holds with respect to internal members; the senses, for example, instincts, powers and faculties, principles and propensities: these are coeval with the individual, and are gradually unfolded, some early, some late. The external senses, being necessary for self-preservation, soon arrive at maturity. Some internal senses, of order for instance, of propriety, of dignity, being of no use during infancy, are not only slow in their progress toward maturity, but require much culture. Among savages they are scarce perceptible.

The moral sense, in its progress, differs from those last men-

(a) Dr Cudworth and Dr Smith.

tioned : it is frequently discovered, even in childhood. It is however slow of growth, and seldom arrives at perfection without culture and experience.

The moral sense not only ripens gradually with the other internal senses mentioned, but from them acquires force and additional authority : a savage makes no difficulty to kill an enemy in cold blood : bloody scenes are familiar to him, and his moral sense is not sufficiently vigorous to give him compunction. The action appears in a different light to a person who has more delicacy of feeling ; and accordingly the moral sense has much more authority over those who have received a refined education, than over savages.

It is pleasant to trace the progress of morality in members of a polished nation. Objects of external sense make the first impressions ; and from them are derived a stock of simple ideas. Affection, accompanying ideas, is first directed to particular objects, such as my brother, my wife, my friend. The mind, opening by degrees, takes in complex objects, such as my country, my religion, the government under which I live ; and these also become objects of affection. Our connections multiply, and the moral sense gaining strength as the mind opens, regulates our duty to each of them. Objects of hatred multiply, as well as objects of affection, and give full scope to dissocial passions, the most formidable antagonists that morality has to encounter. But nature hath provided a remedy : the person who indulges malice or revenge, is commonly the greatest sufferer by the indulgence : men become wise by experience, and have more peace and satisfaction in fostering kindly affection : stormy passions are subdued, or brought under rigid discipline ; and benevolence triumphs over selfishness.

We refine upon the pleasures of society : we learn to submit our opinions : we affect to give preference to others ; and readily fall in with whatever sweetens social intercourse : we carefully avoid

causes of discord; and overlooking trifling offences, we are satisfied with moderate reparation, even for gross injuries.

A nation from its original savage state, grows to maturity like the individuals above described, and the progress of morality is the same in both. The savage state is the infancy of a nation, during which the moral sense is feeble, yielding to custom, to imitation, to passion. But a nation, like a member of a polished society, ripens gradually, and acquires a taste in the fine arts, with acuteness of sense in matters of right and wrong. Hatred and revenge, the great obstacles to moral duty, raged without control, while the privilege of avenging wrongs was permitted to individuals (a). But hatred and revenge yielded gradually to the pleasures of society, and to the growing authority of the moral sense; and benevolent affections prevailed over dissocial passions. In that comfortable period, we hear no more of cruelty as a national character; on the contrary, the aversion we have to an enemy, is even in war exercised with moderation. Nor do the stormy passions ever again revive; for after a nation begins to decline from its meridian height, the passions that prevail are not of the violent kind, but selfish, timorous, and deceitful.

Morality however has not to this day arrived to such maturity as to operate between nations with equal steadiness and vigour as between individuals. Ought this to be regretted as an imperfection in our nature? I think not: had we the same compunction of heart for injuring a nation as for injuring an individual, and were injustice equally blameable as to both, war would cease, and a golden age ensue; than which a greater misfortune could not befall the human race (b).

(a) See Historical Law-tracts, tract 1.

(b) Book 2. sketch 1.

In the progress from maturity to a declining state, a nation differs widely from an individual. Old age puts an end to the latter: there are many causes that weaken the former; but old age is none of them, if it be not in a metaphorical sense. Riches, selfishness, and luxury, are the diseases that weaken prosperous nations: these diseases, following each other in a train, corrupt the heart, dethrone the moral sense, and make an anarchy in the soul: men stick at no expence to purchase pleasure; and they stick at no vice to supply that expence.

Such are the outlines of morality in its progress from birth to burial; and these outlines I propose to fill up with an induction of particulars. Looking back to the commencement of civil society, when no wants were known but those of nature, and when such wants were amply provided for; we find individuals of the same tribe living innocently and cordially together: they had no irregular appetites, nor any ground of strife. In that state, moral principles joined their influence with that of national affection, to secure individuals from harm. Savages accordingly, who have plenty of food, and are simple in habitation and cloathing, seldom transgress the rules of morality within their own tribe. Diodorus Siculus, who composed his history recently after Cæsar's expedition into Britain, says, that the inhabitants dwelt in mean cottages covered with reeds or sticks; that they were of much sincerity and integrity, contented with plain and homely fare; and were strangers to the excess and luxury of rich men. In Friezeland, in Holland, and in other maritime provinces of the Netherlands, locks and keys were unknown, till the inhabitants became rich by commerce: they contented themselves with bare necessities, which every one had in plenty. The Laplanders have no notion of theft. When they make an excursion into Norway, which is performed in the summer months, they leave their huts open, without fear that any thing will be purloined. Formerly, they

were entirely upright in their only commerce, that of bartering the skins of wild beasts for tobacco, brandy, and coarse cloth. But being often cheated by strangers, they begin to be more cunning. Crantz, describing the inhabitants of Iceland before they were corrupted by commerce with strangers, says, that they lived under the same roof with their cattle; that every thing was common among them except their wives and children; and that they were simple in their manners, having no appetite but for what nature requires. In the reign of Edwin King of Northumberland, a child, as historians report, might have travelled with a purse of gold, without hazard of robbery: in our days of luxury, want is so intolerable, that even fear of death is not sufficient to deter us. All travellers agree, that the native Canadians are perfectly disinterested, abhorring deceit and lying. The Californians are fond of iron and sharp instruments; and yet are so strictly honest, that carpenter-tools left open during night, were safe. The savages of North America had no locks for their goods: they probably have learned from Europeans, to be more circumspect. Procopius bears testimony (a), that the Sclavi, like the Huns, were innocent people, free of all malice. Plan Carpin, the Pope's ambassador to the Cham of Tartary, ann. 1246, says, that the Tartars are not addicted to thieving; and that they leave their goods open without a lock. Nicholas Damascenus reports the same of the Celts. The original inhabitants of the island Borneo, expelled by the Mahometans from the sea-coast to the center of the country, are honest, industrious, and kindly to each other: they have some notion of property, but not such as to render them covetous. Pagans in Siberia are numerous; and, tho' grossly ignorant especially in matters of religion, they are a good moral people. It is rare to hear

(a) Historia Gothica, lib. 3.

(b) Kolben

among

among them of perjury, thieving, fraud, or drunkenness; if we except those who live among the Russian Christians, with whose vices they are tainted. Strahlenberg, (a) bears testimony to their honesty. Having employ'd a number of them in a long navigation, he slept in the same boat with men whose names he knew not, whose language he understood not, and yet lost not a particle of his baggage. Being obliged to remain a fortnight among the Ostiaks, upon the river Oby, his baggage lay open in a hut inhabited by a large family, and yet nothing was purloined. The following incident, which he also mentions, is remarkable. A Russian of Tobolski, in the course of a long journey, lodged one night in an Ostiak's hut, and the next day on the road missed his purse with a hundred rubles. His landlord's son, hunting at some distance from the hut, found the purse, but left it there. By his father's order, he covered it with branches, to secure it in case an owner should be found. After three months, the Russian returning, lodged with the same Ostiak, and mentioning occasionally the loss of his purse, the Ostiak, who at first did not recollect his face, cry'd out with joy, "Art thou the man who lost that purse? my son shall go and show thee where it lies, that thou may'st take it up with thine own hand." The Hottentots (b) have not the least notion of theft: tho' immoderately fond of tobacco and brandy, they are employ'd by the Dutch for tending warehouses full of these commodities. Here is an instance of probity above temptation, even among savages in the first stage of social life. Some individuals are more liberally endued than others with virtuous principles: may it not be thought, that in that respect nature has been more kind to the Hottentots

(a) Description of Russia, Siberia, &c.

(b) Kolben.

than

than to many other tribes? Spaniards, settled on the sea-coast of Chili, carry on a commerce with neighbouring savages, for bridles, spurs, knives, and other manufactures of iron; and in return receive oxen, horses, and even children for slaves. A Spaniard carries his goods there; and after obtaining liberty to dispose of them, he moves about, and delivers his goods, without the least reserve, to every one who bargains with him. When all is sold, he intimates his departure; and every purchaser hurries with his goods to him; and it is not known that any one Indian ever broke his engagement. They give him a guard to carry him safe out of their territory, with all the slaves, horses, and cattle he has purchased. The savages of Brazil are faithful to their promises, and to the treaties they make with the Portuguese. Upon some occasions, they may be accused of error and wrong judgement, but never of injustice nor of duplicity.

While the earth was thinly peopled, plenty of food, procured by hunting and fishing, promoted population; but as population lessens the stock of animal food, a savage nation, encreasing in numbers, must spread wider and wider for more game. Thus tribes, at first widely separated from each other, approach gradually till they become neighbours. Hence a new scene with respect to morality. Differences about their hunting-fields, about their game, about personal injuries, multiply between neighbours; and every quarrel is blown into a flame, by the aversion men naturally have to strangers. Anger, hatred, and revenge, find now vent, which formerly lay latent without an object: dissocial passions prevail without control, because among savages morality is no match for them; and cruelty becomes predominant in the human race. Ancient history accordingly is full of enormous cruelties; witness the incursions of the northern barbarians into the Roman empire; and witness the incursions of Genhizcan and Tamerlane

merlane into the fertile countries of Asia, spreading destruction with fire and sword, and sparing neither man, woman, nor infant.

Malevolent passions daily exercised against persons of a different tribe, acquiring strength by exercise, came to be vented against persons even of the same tribe; and the privilege long enjoy'd by individuals, of avenging the wrongs done to them, bestow'd irresistible force upon such passions (*a*). The history of ancient Greece presents nothing to the reader but usurpations, assassinations, and other horrid crimes. The names of many famous for wickedness, are still preserved; Atreus, for example, Eteocles, Alcmeon, Phedra, Clytemnestra. The story of Pelops and his descendants, is a chain of criminal horrors: during that period, parricide and incest were ordinary incidents. Euripides represents Medea vowing revenge against her husband Jason, and laying a plot to poison him. Of that infamous plot the chorus express their approbation, justifying every woman who, in like circumstances, acts the same part.

The frequent incursions of northern barbarians into the Roman empire, spread desolation and ruin through the whole. The Romans, from the highest polish degenerating into savages, assumed by degrees the cruel and bloody manners of their conquerors; and the conquerors and conquered, blended into one mass, equalled the grossest barbarians of ancient times in ignorance and brutality. Clovis, King of the Franks, even after his conversion to Christianity, assassinated without remorse his nearest kinsman. The children of Clodomir, ann. 530, were assassinated by their two uncles. In the thirteenth century, Ezzelino de Aromano obtained the sovereignty of Padua, by massacring 12,000 of his fellow-citizens. Galeas Sforza, Duke of Milan, was assassinated,

(*a*) See Historical Law-tracts, tract 1.

ann. 1476 in the cathedral church of Milan, after the assassins had put up their prayers for courage to perpetrate the deed. It is a still stronger proof how low morality was in those days, that the Pope himself, Sextus IV. attempted to assassinate the two brothers, Laurent and Julien de Medicis; chusing the elevation of the host as a proper time, when the people would be busy about their devotions. Nay more, that very Pope, with unparalleled impudence, excommunicated the Florentines for doing justice upon the intended assassins. The most sacred oaths were in vain employed as a security against that horrid crime. Childebert II. King of the Franks, enticed Magnovald to his court, by a solemn oath that he should receive no harm; and yet made no difficulty to assassinate him during the gaiety of a banquet. But these instances, however horrid, make no figure compared with the massacre of St Bartholomew, where many thousands were inhumanly and treacherously butchered. Even so late as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, assassination was not held in every case to be criminal. Many solicitous applications were made to general councils of Christian clergy, to declare it criminal in every case; but without success. Ferdinand King of Aragon and Navarre, after repeated assassinations and acts of perfidy, obtained the appellation of *Great*: so little authority had the moral sense during these dark ages.

But it is scarce necessary to mention particular instances of the overbearing power of malevolent passions during such ages. An opinion, formerly universal, that the innocent may be justly involved in the same punishment with the guilty, is of itself irrefragable evidence, that morality once had very little influence when opposed by revenge. There is no moral principle more evident, than that punishment cannot be inflicted with justice but upon the guilty; and yet in Greece, the involving of the innocent with the guilty in the same punishment, was authorised even by positive

tive law. By an Athenian law, a man committing sacrilege, or betraying his country, was banished with all his children (a). And when a tyrant was put to death, his children suffered the same fate (b). The punishment of treason in Macedon, was extended against the criminal's relations (c). Hanno, a citizen of Carthage, formed a plot to enslave his country, by poisoning the whole senate at a banquet. He was tortured to death; and his children, with all his relations, were cut off without mercy, tho' they had no accession to his guilt. Among the Japanese, a people remarkably ferocious, it is the practice to involve children and relations in the punishment of capital crimes. Even Cicero, the chief man for learning in the most enlightened period of the Roman republic, and a celebrated moralist, approves that practice: "Nec vero me fugit, quam sit acerbum parentum scelera filiorum poenis lui: sed hoc præclare legibus comparatum est, ut caritas liberorum amiciores parentes reipublicæ redderet * (d)." In Britain, every one knows, that murder was retaliated, not only against the criminal and his relations, but against his whole clan; a practice so common as to be distinguished by a peculiar name, that of *deadly feud*. As late as the days of King Edmund, a law was made in England, prohibiting deadly feud, except between the relations of the person murdered and the murderer himself.

* "I am sensible of the hardship of punishing the child for the crime of the parent: this, however, is a wise enactment of our laws; for hereby the parent is bound to the interest of the state by the strongest of all ties, the affection to his offspring."

(a) Meursæus de legibus Atticis, lib. 2. cap. 2.

(b) Eod. lib. 2. cap. 15.

(c) Quintus Curtius, lib. 6. cap. 11.

(d) Ep. 12. ad Brutum.

I embrace the present opportunity to honour the Jews, by observing, that they were the first people we read of, who had correct notions of morality with respect to the present point. The following law is express: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin (a)." Amaziah, King of Judah, gave strict obedience to that law, in avenging his father's death: "And it came to pass as soon as the kingdom was confirmed in his hand, that he slew his servants which had slain the king his father. But the children of the murderers he slew not; according to that which is written in the book of the law of Moses (b)." There is an elegant passage in Ezekiel to the same purpose (c): "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten four grapes, and the childrens teeth are set on edge: As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Among the Jews however, as among other nations, there are instances without number, of involving innocent children and relations in the same punishment with the guilty. Such power has revenge, as to trample upon conscience, and upon the most express laws. Instigated with rage for Nabal's ingratitude, King David made a vow to God, not to leave alive of all who pertained to Nabal any

(a) Deuteronomy xxiv. 16.

(b) 2 Kings, chap. 14.

(c) Chap. 18.

that

that pisseth against the wall. And it was not any compunction of conscience that diverted him from his cruel purpose, but Nabal's beautiful wife, who pacified him (a). But such contradiction between principle and practice, is not peculiar to the Jews. We find examples of it in the laws of the Roman empire. The true principle of punishment is laid down in an edict of the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius (b). "Sancimus, ibi esse poenam, ubi et noxia est. Propinquos, notos, familiares, procul a calumnia submovemus, quos reos sceleris societas non facit. Nec enim adfinitas vel amicitia nefarium crimen admittunt. Peccata igitur suos teneant auctores : nec ulterius progrediatur metus quam reperiatur delictum. Hoc singulis quibusque iudicibus intimetur.*" These very Emperors, with respect to treason, which touched them nearer than other crimes, talk a very different language. After observing, that will and purpose alone without an overt act, is treason, subjecting the criminal to capital punishment, and to forfeiture of all that belongs to him, they proceed in the following words (c). "Filii vero ejus, quibus vitam Imperatoria specialiter lenitate concedimus, (paterno enim deberent perire supplicio, in quibus paterni, hoc est, hereditarii criminis exempla metuuntur), a materna, vel avita, omnium etiam proxi-

* "We ordain, that the punishment of the crime shall extend to the criminal alone. We hold his relations, his friends, and his acquaintances, unsuspected; for intimacy, friendship, or connection, are no proof or argument of guilt. The consequences of the crime shall pursue only its perpetrator. Let this statute be intimated to all our judges."

(a) 1 Samuel, chap. 25.

(b) l. 22. Cod. De poenis.

(c) l. 5. Cod. ad leg. Jul. majest.

“morum hereditate ac fucceffionē, habeantur alieni: testamentis
 “extraneorum nihil capeant: fint perpetuo egentes et pauperes,
 “infamia eos paterna femper comitetur, ad nullos prorfus hono-
 “res, ad nulla facramenta perveniant: fint postremo tales, ut
 “his, perpetua egeftate fordentibus, fit et mors folatium et vita
 “fupplicium*.”

Human nature is not fo perverse, as without veil or difguife to punifh a perfon acknowledged to be innocent. An irregular bias of imagination, which extends the qualities of the principal to its accessories, paves the way to that unjuft practice (a). That bias, ftrengthened by indignation againft an atrocious criminal, leads the mind haftily to conclude, that all his connections are partakers of his guilt. In an enlightened age, the clearnefs of moral principles fetters the imagination from confounding the innocent with the guilty. There remain traces however of that bias, tho’ not carried fo far as murder. The fentence pronounced againft Ravilliac for affaffinating Henry IV. of France, ordains, “That
 “his houfe be erazed to the ground, and that no other building
 “be ever erected upon that fpot.” Was not this in imagination punifhing a houfe for the proprietor’s crime?

* “By a fpecial extenfion of our imperial clemency, we allow the fons of the
 “criminal to live; altho’, in ftrict juftice, being tainted with hereditary guilt,
 “they ought to fuffer the punifhment of their father. But it is our will, that
 “they fhall be incapable of all inheritance, either from the mother, the grand-
 “father, or any of their kindred; that they fhall be deprived of the power of in-
 “heriting by the teftament of a ftranger; that they fhall be abandoned to the ex-
 “treme of poverty and perpetual indigence; that the infamy of their father fhall
 “ever attend them, incapable of honours, and excluded from the participation
 “of religious rites; that fuch, in fine, fhall be the mifery of their condition, that
 “life fhall be a punifhment, and death a comfort.”

(a) Elements of Criticifm, chap. 2. feft. 5.

Murder and assassination are not only destructive in themselves, but, if possible, still more destructive in their consequences. The practice of shedding blood unjustly, and often wantonly, blunts conscience, and paves the way to every crime. This observation is verified in the ancient Greeks: their cruel and sanguinary character, rendered them little regardful of the strict rules of justice. Right was held to depend on power, among men as among wild beasts: it was conceived to be the will of the gods, that superior force should be a lawful title to dominion; "for what right can the weak have to what they cannot defend?" Were that maxim to obtain, a weak man would have no right to liberty nor to life. That impious doctrine was avowed by the Athenians, and publicly asserted by their ambassadors in a conference with the Melians, reported by Thucydides (a). Many persons act as if force and right were the same; but a barefaced profession of such a doctrine, is uncommon. In the *Eumenides*, a tragedy of *Æschylus*, *Orestes* is arraigned in the *Areopagus* for killing his mother. *Minerva*, president of the court, decrees in favour of *Orestes*: and for what reason? "Having no mother myself, the murder of a mother toucheth not me *." In the tragedy of *Electra*, *Orestes*, consulting the Delphic oracle about means to avenge his father's murder, was enjoined by *Apollo* to forbear

* Athens, from the nature of its government as established by *Solon*, was rendered incapable of any regular or consistent body of laws. In every case, civil and criminal, the whole people were judges in the last resort. And what sort of judges will an ignorant multitude make, who have no guide but passion and prejudice? It is vain to make good laws, when such judges are the interpreters. *Anacharsis*, the Scythian, being present at an assembly of the people, said, "It was singular, that in Athens, wise men pleaded causes, and fools determined them."

(a) Lib. 5.

force,

force, but to employ fraud and guile. Obedient to that injunction, Orestes commands his tutor to spread in Argos the news of his death, and to confirm the same with a solemn oath. In Homer, even the great Jupiter makes no difficulty to send a lying dream to Agamemnon, chief of the Greeks. Dissimulation is recommended by the goddess Minerva (a). Ulysses declares his detestation at using freedom with truth (b): and yet no man deals more in feigned stories (c). In the 22d book of the Iliad, Minerva is guilty of gross deceit and treachery to Hector. When he flies from Achilles, she appears to him in the shape of his brother Deiphobus, exhorts him to turn upon Achilles, and promises to assist him. Hector accordingly, returning to the fight, darts his lance; which rebounds from the shield of Achilles; for by Vulcan it was made impenetrable. Hector calls upon his brother for another lance; but in vain, for Deiphobus was not there. The Greeks in Homer's time must have been strangely deformed in their morals, when such a story could be relished *. A nation begins not to polish nor to advance in morality, till writing be common; and writing was not known among the Greeks at the siege of Troy. Nor were the morals of that people, as we see, much purified for a long time after writing became common.

* Upon the story of Jupiter being deceived by Juno in the 14th book of the Iliad, Pope says, "That he knows not a bolder fiction in all antiquity, nor one that has a greater air of impiety." Pope it would seem was little acquainted with antiquity: for such acts of impiety were common among the Greeks; and in particular the incident mentioned in the text, is not only more impious, but also a more gross violation of the laws of morality.

(a) Odyssey, book 13.

(b) Book 14.

(c) Book 14. book 15.

When

When Plautus wrote, the Roman system of morals must have been extremely impure. In his play termed *Menæchmi*, a gentleman of fashion having accidentally got into his hands a lady's robe with a gold clasp, instead of returning them to the owner, endeavours to sell them without shame or remorse. Such a scene would not be suffered at present, except among pick-pockets. Both the Greeks and Carthaginians were held by the Romans to be artful and cunning. The Romans continued a plain people, with much simplicity of manners, when the nations mentioned had made great progress in the arts of life; and it is a sad truth, that morality declines in proportion as a nation polishes. But if the Romans were later than the Greeks and Carthaginians in the arts of life, they soon surpassed them in every sort of immorality. For this change of manners they were indebted to their rapid conquests. The sanguinary disposition both of the Greeks and Romans, appears from another practice, that of exposing their infant children, which continued till humanity came in some measure to prevail. The practice continues in China to this day, the populousness of the country throwing a veil over the cruelty; but from the humanity of the Chinese, I conjecture, that the practice will be found rare. The Jews, a cloudy and peevish tribe, much addicted to bloodshed, were miserably defective in moral principles. Take the following examples out of an endless number recorded in the books of the Old Testament. Jael, wife of Heber, took under her protection Sisera general of the Canaanites, and engaged her faith for his security. She put him treacherously to death when asleep; and was applauded by Deborah the prophetess for the meritorious action (a). That horrid deed would probably have appeared to her in a different light, had it been committed against Barac, general of the Israelites.

(a) Judges iv. 5.

David, flying from Saul, took refuge with Achish, King of Gath; and tho' protected by that King, made war against the King's allies, saying, that it was against his own countrymen of Judah. "And David saved neither man nor woman alive to bring tidings to Gath. And Achish believed David, saying, He hath made his people Israel utterly to abhor him: therefore he shall be my servant for ever (a)." This was a complication of ingratitude, lying, and treachery. Ziba, by presents to King David, and by defaming his master Mephibosheth, procured from the King a gift of his master's inheritance; tho' Mephibosheth had neither trimmed his beard, nor washed his cloaths, from the day the King departed till he returned in peace. "And it came to pass, when Mephibosheth was come to Jerusalem to meet the king, that the king said unto him, Wherefore wentest thou not with me, Mephibosheth? And he answered, My lord, O king, my servant deceived me; for thy servant said, I will saddle me an ass, that I may ride thereon, and go to the king; because thy servant is lame, and he hath slandered thy servant unto my lord the king. But my lord the king is as an angel of God: do therefore what is good in thine eyes. For all my father's house were but dead men before my lord the king: yet didst thou set thy servant among them that did eat at thine own table: what right therefore have I to cry any more unto the king?" David could not possibly atone for his rashness, but by restoring to Mephibosheth his inheritance, and punishing Ziba in an exemplary manner. But hear the sentence. "And the king said unto him, Why speakest thou any more of thy matters? I have said, Thou and Ziba divide the land (b)." The same king, after pardoning

(a) 1 Samuel, xxvii. 11.

(b) 2 Samuel, xix. 24.

(a) 1 Kings, ii. 37.

(b) Antiquities, book 8.

Shimei for cursing him, and swearing that he should not die; yet upon deathbed enjoined his son Solomon to put Shimei to death: "Now therefore hold him not guiltless; but his hoary head bring thou down to the grave with blood (a)." I wish not to be misapprehended, as intending to censure David in particular. If the best king the Jews ever had, was so miserably deficient in morality, what must be thought of the nation in general? When David was lurking to avoid the wrath of Saul, he became acquainted with Nabal, who had a great stock of cattle. "He discharged his followers," says Josephus (b), "either for avarice, or hunger, or any pretext whatever, to touch a single hair of them; preaching still on the text of doing justice to all men, in conformity to the will of God, who is not pleased with any man that covets or lays violent hands on the goods of his neighbour." Our author proceeds to acquaint us, that Nabal having refused to supply David with provisions, and having sent back the messengers with a scoffing answer, David in great rage made a vow, that he would destroy Nabal with his house and family. Our author observes, that David's indignation against Nabal, was not so much for his ingratitude, as for the virulence of an insolent outrage against one who had never injured him. And what was the outrage? It was, says our author, that Nabal enquiring who the said David was, and being told that he was one of the sons of Jesse, "Yes, yes," says Nabal, "your run-away servants look upon themselves to be brave fellows, I warrant you." Strange looseness of morals! I mean not David, who was in wrath, but Josephus writing sedately in his closet. He every where celebrates David for his justice and piety, composes for him the very warm

(a) 1 Kings, ii. 9.

(b) Antiquities, book 6.

exhortation mentioned above: and yet thinks him not guilty of any wrong, in vowing to break every rule of justice and humanity, upon so slight a provocation as a scoffing expression, such as no man of temper will regard.

European nations, who originally were fierce and sanguinary like the Greeks and Jews, had the same cloudy and uncorrect notions of right and wrong. It is scarce necessary to give instances, the low state of morality during the dark ages of Christianity being known to all. In the time of Louis XI. of France, promises and engagements were utterly disregarded, till they were sanctified by a solemn oath: nor were such oaths long regarded; they lost their force, and were not relied on more than simple promises. All faith among men seemed to be at an end. Even those who appeared the most scrupulous about character, were however ready to grasp at any subterfuge to excuse their breach of engagement. And it is a still stronger proof of self-deceit, that such subterfuges were frequently prepared beforehand, in order to furnish an excuse. It was a common practice some ages ago, to make private protestations, which were thought sufficient to relieve men in conscience from being bound by a solemn treaty. Charles, afterward Emperor of Germany, during his minority, gave authority to declare publicly his accession to a treaty of peace, between his grandfather Maximilian and the King of France: but at the same time protested privately, before a notary and witnesses, "That, notwithstanding his public accession to the said treaty, it was not his intention to be bound by every article of it; and particularly, that the clause reserving to the King of France the sovereignty of certain territories in the Netherlands, should not be binding." Is it possible Charles could be so blind, as not to see, that such practice, if it have any effect, must destroy all faith among men? What better was this than what was practised by Robert King of France in the tenth century, to free his subjects from the guilt of perjury? They swore upon a box of relics, out of which the re-

lics

lics were privately taken. Correa, a Portuguese general, made a treaty with the King of Pegu; and it was agreed, that each party should swear to observe the treaty, laying his hand upon the sacred book of his religion. Correa swore upon a collection of songs, and by that vile stratagem thought that he was not bound. The inhabitants of Britain were so loose formerly, that a man was not reckoned safe in his own house, without a mastiff to protect him from violence. Mastiffs were permitted even to those who dwelt within the king's forests; and to prevent danger to the deer, there was in England a court for *lawing* or *expedition* of mastives, *i. e.* for cutting off the claws of their fore-feet, to prevent them from running (*a*). The trial and condemnation of Charles I. in a pretended court of justice, however audacious and unconstitutional, was yet an effort toward regularity and order. In the preceding age, the king would have been taken off by assassination or poison. Every prince in Europe had an officer whose province it was to secure his master against poison. A lady was appointed to that office by Queen Elizabeth of England; and the form was, to give to each of the servants a mouthful to eat of the dish he brought in. Poison must have been frequent in those days, to make such a regulation necessary. To vouch still more clearly the low ebb of morality during that period, seldom it happened that a man of figure died suddenly, or of an unusual disease, but poison was suspected. Men conscious of their own vicious disposition, are prone to suspect others. The Dauphin, son to Francis I. of France, a youth of about eighteen, having overheated himself at play, took a great draught of iced water, and died of a pleurisy in five days. The death was sudden, but none is more natural. The suspicion however of poison was universal; and Montecuculi, who attended the young prince, was formally condemned to death and executed.

(*a*). Carta de Foresta, cap. 6.

executed for it; for no better reason, than that he had at all times ready access to the prince.

Considering the low state of morality where dissocial passions bear rule, as in the scenes now display'd, one would require a miracle to recover mankind out of such anarchy. But, as observed above (a), Providence brings order out of confusion. The intolerable distress of a state of things where a promise, or even an oath, is a rope of sand, and where all are set against all (b), made people at last sensible, that they must either renounce society altogether, or qualify themselves for it, by checking their dissocial passions. Finding from experience, that the gratification of social affections exceeds greatly that of cruelty and revenge, men endeavoured to acquire a habit of self-command, and of restraining their stormy passions. The necessity of fulfilling every moral duty was recognised: men listened to conscience, the voice of God in their hearts: and the moral sense was cordially submitted to, as the ultimate judge in all matters of right and wrong. Salutary laws and steady government contributed to perfect that glorious revolution: private conviction alone would not have been effectual, not at least in many ages.

From that revolution is derived what is termed *the law of nations*, meaning certain regulations dictated by the moral sense in its maturity. The laws of our nature refine gradually as our nature refines. The putting an enemy to death in cold blood, is averse to improved nature, tho' common while barbarity prevailed. It is held infamous to use poisoned weapons, tho' the moral sense made little opposition while rancour and revenge were ruling passions. Aversion against strangers is taught to vary its object, from

(a) Book I. sketch 1.

(b) Hobbes.

individuals,

individuals, to the nation that is our enemy : I bear enmity against France ; but dislike not any one Frenchman, being conscious that it is the duty of subjects to serve their king and country *. In distributing justice, we make no distinction between natives and foreigners : if any partiality be indulged, it is in favour of the helpless stranger.

But cruelty is not the only antagonist to morality. There is another, less violent indeed, but more cunning and undermining ; and that is the hoarding-appetite. Before money was introduced, that appetite was extremely faint : in the first stage of civil society, men are satisfied with plain necessities ; and having these in plenty, they think not of providing against want. But money is a species of property, so universal in operation, and so permanent in value, as to rouse the appetite for hoarding : love of money excites industry ; and the many beautiful productions of industry, magnificent houses, splendid gardens, rich garments, inflame the appetite to an extreme. In the thirteenth century, so obscured was the moral sense by rapacity and avarice, that robbery on the highway, and the coining false money, were in Germany held to be privileges of great lords. That perjury was common in the city of London, especially among jurymen, makes a preamble in more than one statute of Henry VII. In *the Dance of Death*, translated from the French in the said king's reign, with additions adapted to English manners, a jurymen is introduced, who, influenced by bribes, had often given a false verdict. And the sheriff was often suspected as accessory to the crime, by returning for jurymen persons of a bad character. Carew, in his account of Cornwall, says,

* In one of our ill-concerted descents upon France during the late war, signal humanity appeared, in forbearing to burn a manufactory of ~~fine and scraps~~ belonging to the King ; because it would have destroy'd an adjoining building of the same kind belonging to a private manufacturer.

that

that it was an ordinary article in an attorney's bill, to charge *pro amicitia vicecomitis* *. Perjury in jurors of the city of London, is greatly complained of. Stow informs us, that, in the year 1468, many jurors of that city were punished, and papers fixed on their heads, declaring their offence, of being corrupted by the parties to the suit. He complains of that corruption as flagrant in the reign of Elisabeth, when he wrote his account of London. Fuller, in his English Worthies, mentions it as a proverbial saying, "That London juries hang half, and save half." Grafton, in his Chronicle, mentions, that the chancellor of the Bishop of London being indicted for murder, the Bishop wrote a letter to Cardinal Wolsey, begging his interposition for having the prosecution stopt, "because London juries were so corrupted, that they would find Abel guilty of the murder of Cain." In that period, the morals of the English were in every particular extremely loose. We learn from Strype's annals (a), that in the county of Somerset alone, forty persons were executed in one year for robbery, theft, and other felonies, thirty-five burnt in the hand, thirty-seven whipped, one hundred and eighty-three discharged, tho' most wicked and desperate persons; and yet that the fifth part of the felonies committed in that county were not brought to trial, either from cunning in the felons, indolence in the magistrate, or foolish lenity in the people; that other counties were in no better condition, and many in a worse; and that commonly there were three or four hundred able-bodied vagabonds in every county, who lived by theft and rapine. Harrison computes, that in the reign of Henry VIII. seventy-two thousand thieves and rogues were hanged; and that in Elisabeth's time there were

* "For the friendship of the sheriff."

(a) Vol. 4.

only

only hanged yearly between three and four hundred for theft and robbery. At present, there are not forty hanged in a year for these crimes. The same author reports, that in the reign of Elizabeth, there were computed to be in England ten thousand gypsies. In the year 1601, complaints were made in parliament, of the rapine of the justices of peace; and a member said, that this magistrate was an animal, who, for half a dozen of chickens, would dispense with a dozen of penal statutes. The people of Whidah, in Guinea, are much addicted to pilfering. Bosman was told by the King, "That his subjects were not like those of Arrah, who on the slightest umbrage will poison an European. This, says he, you have no reason to apprehend here: but take care of your goods; for so expert are my people at thieving, that they will steal from you while you are looking on." The Caribbeans, who know no wants but what nature inspires, are amaz'd at the industry of the Europeans in amassing wealth. Listen to one of them expostulating with a Frenchman in the following terms: "How miserable art thou, to expose thy person to tedious and dangerous voyages, and to suffer thyself to be oppressed with anxiety about futurity! An inordinate appetite for wealth is thy bane; and yet thou art no less tormented in preserving the goods thou hast acquired, than in acquiring more: fear of robbery or shipwreck suffers thee not to enjoy a quiet moment. Thus thou growest old in thy youth, thy hair turns gray, thy forehead is wrinkled, a thousand ailments afflict thy body, a thousand distresses surround thy heart, and thou movest with painful hurry to the grave. Why art thou not content with what thy own country produceth? Why not condemn superfluities, as we do?"

To control the hoarding appetite, which when inflamed is the bane of civil society, the God of nature has provided two efficacious principles; the moral sense, and the sense of property. The
hoarding

hoarding appetite, it is true, is more and more inflamed by beautiful productions in the progress of art: but, on the other hand, the senses mentioned growing to maturity, have a commanding influence over the actions of men; and, when cherished in a good government, are a sufficient counterbalance to the hoarding appetite. The ancient Egyptians enjoy'd for ages the blessings of good government; and moral principles were among them carried to a greater degree of refinement, than at present even in our courts of equity. It was made the duty of every one, to succour those who were unjustly attacked: even passengers were not exempted. A regulation among them, that a man could not be imprisoned for debt, was well suited to the tenor of their laws and manners: it could not have taken place but among an honest and industrious people. In old Rome, tho' remarkable for temperance and austerity of manners, a debtor could be imprisoned, and even sold as a slave, for payment of the debt; but the Patricians were the creditors, and the poor Plebeians were held in woful subjection *. The moderation

* A bankrupt in England who pays three fourths of his debt, and obtains a certificate of his good behaviour, is discharged of all the debts contracted by him before his bankruptcy. Such regulation was perhaps not unsuitable to the moderation and frugality of the period when it was made. But luxury and external show, have now become our ruling passions; and to supply our extravagance, money must be procured at any rate. Trade in particular has degenerated into a species of gaming; men venturing their all, in hopes of a lucky hit to elevate them above their neighbours. And did they only venture their own, the case would not be deplorable: they venture all they can procure upon credit; and by that means, reduce to beggary many an innocent family: with respect to themselves, they know the worst of it, which is to be clear'd from their debts by a certificate. The morals of our people are indeed at so low an ebb, as to require the most severe laws against bankruptcy. When a man borrows a sum, it is implied in the covenant, that all his effects present and future shall lie open to the creditor; for which reason, it is contradictory to justice, that a creditor should be forc'd to discharge

moderation of the inhabitants of Hamburgh, and their public spirit, kept in vigour by a free government, preserve morality among them entire from taint or corruption. I give an illustrious instance. Instead of a tax upon trade or riches, every merchant puts privately into the public chest, what he thinks ought to be his contribution: the total sum seldom falls short of expectation; and among that numerous body of men, not one is suspected of contributing less than his proportion. But luxury has not yet got footing in that city. A climate not kindly, and a soil not fertile, enured the Swifs to temperance and to virtue. Patriotism continues their ruling passion: they are fond of serving their country; and are honest and faithful to each other: a law-suit among them is a wonder; and a door is seldom shut unless to keep out cold.

The hurtful effects of the hoarding appetite with respect to individuals, make no figure compared with its poisonous influence upon the public, in every state enriched by conquest or by commerce; which I have had more than one opportunity to mention.

charge his debtor without obtaining complete payment. Many debtors, it is true, deserve favour; but it ought to be left to the humanity of creditors, and not be forc'd from them by law. The debtor, at the same time, may be safely left to the humanity of his creditors: for if he have conducted his affairs with strict integrity, and with any degree of prudence, there will scarce be found one man so hard-hearted, as to stand out against the laudable and benevolent intentions of his fellow-creditors. Nay, if he have any regard to character, he dares not stand out: he would be held as a monster, and be abhorred by all the world. To leave a bankrupt thus to the mercy of his creditors, would produce the most salutary effects. It would excite men to be strictly just in their dealings, and put an end to gaming, so destructive to credit; because misbehaviour in any of these particulars would set the whole creditors against their debtor, and leave him no hope of favour. In the late bankrupt-statute for Scotland, accordingly, the clause concerning the certificate was wisely left out, as unsuitable to the depraved manners of the present times.

Overflowing riches unequally distributed, multiply artificial wants beyond all bounds: they eradicate patriotism: they foster luxury, sensuality, and selfishness, which are commonly gratified at the expence even of justice and honour. The Athenians were early corrupted by opulence; to which every thing was made subservient. "It is an oracle," says the chorus in the Agamemnon of Eschylus, "that is not purchased with money." During the infancy of a nation, vice prevails from imbecility in the moral sense: in the decline of a nation, it prevails from the corruption of affluence.

In a small state, there is commonly much virtue at home, and much violence abroad. The Romans were to their neighbours more baneful than famine or pestilence; but patriotism in them occasioned great integrity at home. An oath when given to fortify an engagement with a fellow-citizen, was more sacred at Rome than in any other part of the world (a). The censorian office cannot succeed but among a virtuous people; because its rewards and punishments have no influence but upon those who are ashamed of vice*. As soon as Asiatic opulence and luxury prevailed in Rome, selfishness, sensuality, and avarice, formed the character of the Romans; and the censorian power was at an end. Such relaxation of morals ensued, as to make a law necessary prohibiting the custody of an infant to be given to the heir, for fear of murder. And for the same reason, it was held unlawful to make a covenant *de hereditate viventis*. These regulations prove the

* In the fifteenth century, the French clergy from the pulpit censured public transactions, and even the conduct of their king, as our British clergy did in the days of Charles I. and II. They assumed the privilege of a Roman censor; but they were not men of such authority as to do any good in a corrupted nation.

(a) L'Esprit des loix, liv. 8. ch. 13.

Romans to have been grossly corrupt. Our law is different in both articles; because it entertains not the same bad opinion of the people whom it governs. Domitius Enobarbus and Appius Pulcher were consuls of Rome in the 699th year; and Memmius and Calvinus were candidates for succeeding them in that office. It was agreed among these four worthy gentlemen, that they should mutually assist each other. The consuls engaged to promote the election of Memmius and Calvinus: and they, on the other hand, subscribed a bond, obliging themselves, under a penalty of about L. 3000 Sterling, to procure three augurs, who should attest, that they were present in the comitia when a law passed, investing the consuls with military command in their provinces; and also obliging themselves to produce three persons of consular rank, to depose, that they were not only present in the senate, but actually in the number of those who signed a decree, conferring on the consuls the usual proconsular appointments. And yet the law made in the comitia, and the decree in the senate, were pure fictions, never even spoken of. Infamous as this transaction was, Memmius, to answer some political purpose, was not ashamed to divulge it to the senate. This same Memmius, however, continued to be Cicero's correspondent, and his professed friend. *Proh tempora! proh mores!* But power and riches were at that time ruling passions; and the principles of morality were very little regarded.

It is needless to dissemble, that selfishness, sensuality, and avarice, must in England be the fruits of great opulence, as in every other country; and that morality cannot maintain its authority against such undermining antagonists. Customhouse-oaths have become so familiar among us, as to be swallowed without a wry face; and is it certain, that bribery and perjury in electing parliament-members, are not approaching to the same cool state? In the infancy of morality, a promise makes but a slight impression: to give it

U u 2 force,

force, it is commonly accompanied with many solemnities (a); and in treaties between sovereigns, even these solemnities are not relied on without a solemn oath. When morality arrives at maturity, the oath is thought unnecessary; and at present, morality is so much on the decline, that a solemn oath is not more relied on, than a simple promise was originally. Laws have been made to prevent such immorality, but in vain: because none but patriots have an interest to support them; and when patriotism is banished by corruption, there is no remaining spring in government to make them effectual. The statutes made against gaming, and against bribery and corruption in elections, have no authority over a degenerate people. Nothing is studied, but how to evade the penalties; and supposing statutes to be made without end for preventing known evasions, new evasions will spring up in their stead. The misery is, that such laws, if they prove abortive, are never innocent with regard to consequences; for nothing is more subversive of morality as well as of patriotism, than a habit of disregarding the laws of our country *.

But

(a) See Historical Law-tracts, tract 2.

* Lying and perjury are not in every case equally criminal; at least are not commonly reckoned so. Lying or perjury, in order to injure a man, is held highly criminal; and the greater the hurt, the greater the crime. To relieve from punishment, few boggle at a lie or at perjury: sincerity is not even expected; and hence the practice of torture. Many men are not scrupulous about oaths, when they have no view but to obtain justice to themselves: the Jacobites, that they might not be deprived of their privileges as British subjects, made no great difficulty to swallow oaths to the present government, tho' in them it was perjury. It is dangerous to withdraw the smallest peg in the moral edifice; for the whole will totter and tumble. Men creep on to vice by degrees. Perjury, in order to support a friend, has become customary of late years; witness fictitious qualifications in the electors of parliament-men, which are made effectual by perjury: yet such is the degeneracy of the present times, that no man is the worse thought of upon that

But pride sometimes happily interposes to stem the tide of corruption. The poor are not ashamed to take a bribe from the rich; nor weak states from those that are powerful, disguised only under the name of *subsidy* or *pension*. Both France and England have been in the practice of securing the alliance of some foreign princes by pensions; and it is natural in the ministers of a pensioned prince, to receive a gratification for keeping their master to his engagement. England never was at any time so inferior to France, as to suffer their king to accept a pension, whatever private transactions might be between the kings themselves. But the ministers of England thought it no disparagement, to receive pensions from France. Every minister of Edward IV. of England received a pension from Louis XI.; and they made no difficulty of granting a receipt accordingly. The old Earl of Warwick, says Commynes, was the only exception: he took the money, but refused a receipt. Cardinal Wolsey had a pension both from the Emperor and from the King of France: and his master Henry was vain, that his minister was so much regarded by the first powers in Europe. During the reigns of Charles II. and of his brother James, England made so despicable a figure, that the ministers accepted pensions from Louis XIV. A king void of virtue was never well served. King Charles, most disgracefully, accepted a pension from France: what scruple could his ministers have? Britain, governed by a king eminently virtuous and patriotic, makes at present so great a figure, that even the lowest minister would disdain a pension from any foreign prince. Men formerly were so blind as not to see, that a pension creates a bias in a minister, against his master and his country. At present, that account. We must not flatter ourselves that the poison will reach no farther: a man who boggles not at perjury to serve a friend, will in time become such an adept, as to commit perjury in order to ruin a friend when he becomes an enemy.

men

men are so quick-sighted as clearly to see, that a foreign pension to a minister is no better than a bribe; and it would be held so by all the world.

In a nation enriched by conquest or commerce, where selfish passions always prevail, it is difficult to stem the tide of immorality: the decline of virtue may be retarded by wholesome regulations; but no regulations will ever restore it to its meridian vigour. Marcus Aurelius, Emperor of Rome, caused statues to be made of all the brave men who figured in the Germanic war. It has long been a practice in China, to honour persons eminent for virtue, by feasting them annually at the Emperor's expence. A late Emperor made an improvement: he ordered reports to be sent him annually, of men and women who when alive had been remarkable for public spirit or private virtue, in order that monuments might be erected to their memory. The following report is one of many that were sent to the Emperor. "According to the order of your Majesty, for erecting monuments to the honour of women, who have been celebrated for continence, for filial piety, or for purity of manners, the viceroy of Canton reports, that in the town of Sinhoei, a beautiful young woman, named *Leang*, sacrificed her life to save her chastity. In the fifteenth year of our Emperor Canghi, she was dragg'd by pirates into their ship; and having no other way to escape their brutal lust, she threw herself headlong into the sea. Being of opinion, that to prefer honour before life is an example worthy of imitation, we purpose, according to your Majesty's order, to erect a triumphal arch for that young woman, and to engrave her story upon a large stone, that it may be preserved in perpetual remembrance." At the foot of the report is written, *The Emperor approves.* Pity it is, that such regulations should ever prove abortive, for their purpose is excellent. But they would need angels to put them in execution. Every deviation from a
just

just selection enervates them; and frequent deviations render them a subject of ridicule. But how are deviations to be prevented, when men are the judges? Those who distribute the rewards will prefer their friends, and overlook those of greater merit. Like the censorian power in Rome, such regulations, after many abuses, will sink into contempt.

Two errors, which infested morality in dark times, have occasioned much injustice; and I am not certain, that they are yet totally eradicated. The first is an opinion, That an action derives its quality of right and wrong from the event, without regard to intention. The other is, That the end justifies the means; or, in other words, That means, otherwise unlawful, may be lawfully employ'd to bring about a good end. With an account of these two errors, I shall close the present historical sketch.

That intention is the circumstance which qualifies an action, and its author, to be criminal or innocent, is made evident in the first part of the present sketch, and is now admitted to be so by every moral writer. But rude and barbarous nations seldom carry their thoughts beyond what falls under their external senses: they conclude an action to be right that happens to do good, and an action to be wrong that happens to do harm; without ever thinking of motives, of Will, of intention, or of any circumstance that is not obvious to eye-sight. From many passages in the Old Testament it appears, that the external act only, with its consequences, were regarded. Isaac, imitating his father Abraham, made his wife Rebecca pass for his sister. Abimelech, King of the Philistines, having discovered the imposture, said to Isaac, "What is this thou hast done unto us? One of the people might lightly have lien with thy wife, and thou shouldst have brought guiltiness upon us (a)." Jonathan was condemned to die

(a) Genesis, chap. 26.

for transgressing a prohibition he had never heard of (a). A sin of ignorance, *i. e.* an action done without ill intention, required a sacrifice of expiation (b). Saul being defeated by the Philistines, fell on his own sword: the wound not being mortal, he prevailed on a young Amalekite, to pull out the sword, and to dispatch him with it. Josephus (c) says, that David ordered the criminal to be delivered up to justice as a regicide.

The Greeks appear to have wavered greatly about intention, sometimes holding it essential to a crime, and sometimes disregarding it as a circumstance of no moment. Of these contradictory opinions we have pregnant evidence in the two tragedies of Oedipus; the first taking it for granted, that a crime consists entirely in the external act and its consequences; the other holding intention to be indispensable. Oedipus had killed his father Laius, and married his mother Jocasta; but without any criminal intention, being ignorant of his relation to them. And yet history informs us, that the gods punished the Thebans with pestilence, for suffering a wretch so grossly criminal to live. Sophocles, author of both tragedies, puts the following words in the mouth of Tiresias the prophet.

——— Know then,
That Oedipus, in shameful bonds united,
With those he loves, unconscious of his guilt,
Is yet most guilty.

And that doctrine is espoused by Aristotle in a later period, who holding Oedipus to have been deeply criminal, tho' without intention, is of opinion, that a more proper subject for tragedy ne-

(a) 1 Samuel, xiv. 44.

(b) Leviticus, chap. 4.

(c) Book 3. of Antiquities.

ver was brought upon the stage. Nay as a philosopher he talks currently of an involuntary crime. Orestes, in Euripides, acknowledges himself to be guilty in killing his mother; yet asserts with the same breath, that his crime was inevitable, a necessary crime, a crime commanded by religion.

In Oedipus Coloneus, the other tragedy mentioned, a very different proposition is maintained. A defence is made for that unlucky man, agreeable to sound moral principles, that, having had no bad intention, he was entirely innocent; and that his misfortunes ought to be ascribed to the wrath of the gods.

Thou who upbraid'st me thus for all my woes,

Murder and incest, which against my will

I had committed; so it pleas'd the gods,

Offended at my race for former crimes.

But I am guiltless; can'st thou name a fault

Deserving this? For, tell me, was it mine,

When to my father, Phœbus did declare,

That he should one day perish by the hand

Of his own child; was Oedipus to blame,

Who had no being then? If, born at length

To wretchedness, he met his fire unknown,

And slew him, that involuntary deed

Can'st thou condemn? And for my fatal marriage,

Dost thou not blush to name it? was not she

Thy sister, she who bore me, ignorant

And guiltless woman! afterwards my wife,

And mother to my children? What she did, she did un-

knowing.

But, not for that, nor for my murder'd father,

Have I deserv'd thy bitter taunts: for, tell me,

Thy life attack'd, wouldst thou have said to ask

VOL. II.

X x

Th' assassin,

Th' affassin, if he were thy father? No;
 Self-love would urge thee to revenge the insult.
 Thus was I drove to ill by th' angry gods;
 This, shou'd my father's soul revisit earth,
 Himself would own, and pity Oedipus.

Again, in the fourth act, the following prayer is put up for Oedipus by the chorus.

————— O grant,
 That not oppress'd by tort'ring pain
 Beneath the stroke of death he linger long;
 But swift, with easy steps, descend to Styx's drear abode;
 For he hath led a life of toil and pain;
 May the just gods repay his undeserved woe.

The audience was the same in both plays. Did they think Oedipus to be guilty in the one play, and innocent in the other? If they did not, how could both plays be relished? if they did, they must have been grossly stupid.

The statues of a Roman Emperor were held so sacred, that to treat them with any contempt was high treason. This ridiculous opinion was carried so far out of common sense, that a man was held guilty of high treason, if a stone thrown by him happened accidentally to touch one of these statues. And the law continued in force till abrogated by a rescript of Severus Antoninus (a).

In England, so little was intention regarded, that casual homicide, and even homicide in self-defence, were capitally punished. It requires strong evidence to vouch so absurd a law; and I have the strongest, viz. the act 32^o Henry III. cap. 26. converting the capital punishment into a forfeiture of moveables. The same gross blunder continued much longer to be law in Scotland. By act 19.

(a) l. 5. ad leg. Jul. Majest.

parl. 1649, renewed act 22. parl. 1661, the capital punishment is converted to imprisonment, or a fine to the wife and children. In a period so late as the Restoration, strange blindness it was, not to perceive, that homicide in self-defence, being a lawful act, justified by the strictest rules of morality, subjects not a man to punishment, more than the defending his property against a robber; and that casual homicide, meaning homicide committed innocently without ill intention, may subject him to reparation, but never to any punishment, mild or severe.

The Jesuits in their doctrines seem to rest on the external act, disregarding intention. It is with them a matter of perfect indifference, from what motive men obey the laws of God; and that the service of those who obey from fear of punishment, is no less acceptable to the Deity, than of those who obey from a principle of love*.

The other error mentioned above, is, That the end justifies the means. In defence of that proposition, it is urged, that the character of the means is derived from the end; that every action must be right which contributes to a good end, and that every action must be wrong which contributes to an ill end. But those who reason thus, ought first to consider, whether reasoning be at all applicable to the present subject. Reason is the true touchstone of truth and falsehood; but the moral sense is the only touchstone of right and wrong; and to maintain, that reason is our guide in judging of right and wrong, is no less absurd than to maintain,

* External show made a great figure, when nothing was regarded but what is visible. By acuteness of judgement, and refinement of taste, the pleasures of society prevail, and forms and ceremonies are disregarded. External show, however, continues to stand its ground in several instances. It occasions, in particular, many an ill-fort'd match: a young man is apt to be captivated with beauty or dress; a young woman with equipage or a title.

that the moral sense is our guide in judging of truth and falsehood. The moral sense dictates, that on no pretext whatever is it lawful to do an act of injustice, or any wrong (*a*): and men, conscious that the moral sense governs in matters of right and wrong, submit implicitly to its dictates. Influenced however by the reasoning mentioned, during the nonage of the moral sense, men did wrong currently in order to bring about a good end; witness pretended miracles and forged writings, urged without reserve by every sect of Christians against their antagonists. And I am sorry to observe, that the error is not totally eradicated: missionaries employ'd in converting infidels to the true faith, are little scrupulous about the means: they make no difficulty to feign prodigies in order to convert those who are not moved by argument. Such pious frauds tend to sap the very foundations of morality.

(*a*) See the first part of this sketch, § 2. at the end.

SKETCH

S K E T C H I I I.

Principles and Progress of THEOLOGY.

AS no branch of knowledge can vie with theology, either in dignity or importance, it justly claims to be a favourite study with every person endued with true taste and solid judgment. From the time that writing was invented, natural religion has employ'd pens without number; and yet in no language is there found a complete history of it. That task is far above my abilities: I propose only a slight sketch; which I shall glory in, however imperfect, if it excite any one of superior talents to undertake a task so arduous.

C H A P. I.

Existence of a DEITY.

THat there are beings, one or many, powerful above men, has been generally believed among the various tribes of men: I may say universally believed, notwithstanding what is reported of some gross savages; for reports repugnant to the common nature of man, require more able vouchers than a few illiterate voyagers. Among many savage tribes, there are no words
but

but for objects of external sense: is it surprising, that such people are incapable to express their religious perceptions, or any perception of internal sense? and from their silence can it be fairly presumed, that they have no such perception *? The belief of superior powers, in every country where there are words to express it, is so well vouched, that in fair reasoning it ought to be taken for granted among the few tribes where language is deficient. Even the grossest idolatry affords to me evidence of that belief. No nation can be so brutish as to worship a stock or a stone, merely as such. The visible object is always imagined to be connected with some invisible power; and the worship paid to the former, is as representing the latter, or as in some manner connected with it. Every family among the ancient Lithuanians, entertained a real serpent as a household god; and the same practice is at present universal, among the negroes in the kingdom of Whidah: it is not the serpent that is worshipped, but some deity imagined to reside in it. The ancient Egyptians were not idiots, to pay divine honours to a bull or a cat, as such: the divine honours were paid to a deity, as residing in these animals. The sun is to man a familiar object: as it is frequently obscured by clouds, and totally eclipsed during night, a savage readily conceives it to be a great fire, sometimes flaming bright, sometimes obscured, and sometimes extinguished. Whence then sun-worship, once universal among savages? Plainly from the same cause: it is not properly the sun that is worshipped, but a deity who is supposed to dwell in that luminary.

* In the language even of Peru, there is not a word for expressing an abstract idea, such as *time*, *endurance*, *space*, *existence*, *substance*, *matter*, *body*. It is no less defective in expressing moral ideas, such as *virtue*, *justice*, *gratitude*, *liberty*. The Yameos, a tribe on the river Oroonoko, described by Condamine, use the word *poettarraroincouroac* to express the number three, and have no word for a greater number. The Brazilian language is nearly as barren,

Taking

Taking it then for granted, that our belief of superior powers has been long universal, the important question is, From what cause it proceeds. A belief so universal, and so permanent, cannot proceed from chance, but must have a cause operating constantly and invariably upon all men in all ages. Philosophers, who believe the world to be eternal and self-existent, and imagine it to be the only deity, tho' without intelligence, endeavour to account for our belief of superior powers, from the terror that thunder and other elementary convulsions raise in savages; and thence conclude that such belief is no evidence of a deity. Thus Lucretius,

Præterea, cui non animus formidine divum

Contrahitur? cui non conripunt membra pavore,

Fulminis horribili cum plaga torrida tellus

Contremittit, et magnum percurrunt murmura cœlum * (a) †

And Petronius Arbiter,

Primus in orbe deos fecit timor: ardua cœlo

Fulmina quum caderent discussaque mœnia flammis,

Atque ictus flagraret Athos ‡.

Man, during infancy a defenceless animal, is endued on that ac-

* What man can boast, that firm undaunted soul,

That hears, unmov'd, when thunder shakes the pole;

Nor shrinks with fear of an offended pow'r,

When lightnings flash, and storms and tempests roar?

† When dread convulsions rock'd the lab'ring earth,

And livid clouds first gave the thunder birth,

Instinctive fear within the human breast

The first ideas of a God impress'd.

(a) Lib. 5.

count

count with a large portion of fear. Savages, grossly ignorant of causes and effects, take fright at every unusual appearance, and recur to some malignant power as the cause. Now, if the authors quoted mean only, that the first perception of deity among savages is occasioned by fear, I heartily subscribe to their opinion. But if it was their meaning, that such perceptions proceed from fear solely, without having any other cause, I wish to be informed, from what source is derived the belief we have of superior benevolent beings. Fear cannot be the source: and it will be seen anon, that tho' malevolent deities were first recognised among savages; yet that in the progress of society, the existence of benevolent deities was universally believed. The fact is certain; and therefore fear is not the sole cause of our believing the existence of superior beings.

It is beside to me evident, that the belief even of malevolent deities, once universal among all the tribes of men, cannot be accounted for from fear solely. I observe, first, That there are many men, to whom an eclipse, an earthquake, and even thunder, are unknown: Egypt in particular, tho' the country of superstition, is little or not at all acquainted with the two latter. Nor do such appearances strike terror into every one who is acquainted with them. The universality of the belief, must then have some cause more universal than fear. I observe next, That if the belief were founded solely on fear, it would die away gradually as men improve in the knowledge of causes and effects. Instruct a savage, that thunder, an eclipse, an earthquake, proceed from natural causes, and are not threatenings of an incensed deity; his fear of malevolent beings will vanish; and with it his belief in them, if founded solely on fear. Yet the direct contrary is true: in proportion as the human understanding ripens, our belief of superior powers, or of a Deity, turns more and more firm and authoritative;

tive; which will be made evident in the chapter immediately following.

Philosophers of more enlarged views, and of deeper penetration, may possibly think, that the operations of nature, and the government of this world, which loudly proclaim a Deity, may be sufficient to open the eyes of the grossest savages, and to convince them that there is a Deity. And to give due weight to the argument, I shall relate a conversation between a Greenlander and a Danish missionary, mentioned by Crantz in his history of Greenland. "It is true," says the Greenlander, "we were ignorant of Heathens, and knew little of a God, till you came. But you must not imagine, that no Greenlander thinks about these things. A kajak (a), with all its tackle and implements, cannot exist but by the labour of man; and one who does not understand it, would spoil it. But the meanest bird requires more skill than the best kajak; and no man can make a bird. There is still more skill required to make a man: by whom then was he made? He proceeded from his parents, and they from their parents. But some must have been the first parents: whence did they proceed? Common report says, that they grew out of the earth: if so, why do not men still grow out of the earth? And from whence came the earth itself, the sun, the moon, the stars? Certainly there must be some being who made all these things, a being more wise than the wisest man." The reasoning here from effects to their causes, is stated with great precision; and were all men equally penetrating with the Greenlander, such reasoning might perhaps be sufficient to account for the belief of Deity, universally spread among all savages. But such penetration is a rare quality among savages.

(a) A Greenland boat.

ges ; and yet the belief of superior powers is universal, not excepting even the grossest savages, who are altogether incapable of reasoning like our Greenland philosopher. Natural history has made so rapid a progress of late years, and the finger of God is so visible to us in the various operations of nature, that we do not readily conceive how even savages can be ignorant : but it is a common fallacy in reasoning, to judge of others by what we feel in ourselves. And to give juster notions of the condition of savages, I take liberty to introduce the Wogultzoi, a people in Siberia, as exhibiting a striking picture of savages in their natural state. That people were baptized at the command of Prince Gagarin, governor of the province ; and Laurent Lange, in his relation of a journey from Petersburg to Pekin ann. 1715, gives the following account of their conversion. “ I had curiosity,” says he, “ to question them about their worship before they embraced Christianity. They said, that they had an idol hung upon a tree, before which they prostrated themselves, raising their eyes to heaven, and howling with a loud voice. They could not explain what they meant by howling ; but only, that every man howled in his own fashion. Being interrogated, Whether, in raising their eyes to heaven, they knew that a god is there, who sees all the actions, and even the thoughts of men ; they answered simply, That heaven is too far above them to know whether a god be there or not ; and that they had no care but to provide meat and drink. Another question was put, Whether they had not more satisfaction in worshipping the living God, than they formerly had in the darkness of idolatry ; they answered, We see no great difference ; and we do not break our heads about such matters.” Judge how little capable such ignorant savages are, to reason from effects to their causes, and to trace a Deity from the operations of nature. And it may be added with great certainty, that could they be made in any degree

gree to conceive such reasoning, yet so weak and obscure would their conviction be, as to rest there without moving them to any sort of worship; which however among savages goes hand in hand with the belief of superior powers.

To sum up this argument: As fear is a cause altogether insufficient for the belief of Deity, universal among all tribes; and as reasoning from effects to their causes can have no influence upon ignorant savages; what cause remains but nature itself? To make this belief universal, the image of the Deity must be stamp'd upon the mind of every human being, the ignorant equally with the knowing: nothing less is sufficient. And the perception we have of Deity must proceed from an internal cause, which may be termed the *sense of Deity*.

Included in the sense of Deity, is the duty we are under to worship him. And to enforce that duty, the principle of devotion is made a part of our nature. All men accordingly agree in worshipping superior beings, however they may differ in the mode of worship. And the universality of such worship, proves devotion to be an innate principle.

The perception we have of being accountable beings, arises from another branch of the sense of Deity. We expect approbation from the Deity when we do right; and dread punishment from him when guilty of any crime; not excepting the most occult crimes, hid from every mortal eye. From what cause can dread proceed in that case, but from belief of a superior being, avenger of wrongs? That dread, when immoderate, disorders the mind, and makes every unusual misfortune pass for a punishment inflicted by an invisible hand. "And they said one to another, We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear: therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben answered them, saying, Spake I not unto you, saying,

Y y 2

" Do

“Do not sin against the child; and ye would not hear? therefore behold also his blood is required (a).” Alphonfus King of Naples, was a cruel and tyrannical prince. He drove his people to despair with oppressive taxes, treacherously assassinated several of his barons, and loaded others with chains. During prosperity, his conscience gave him little disquiet; but in adversity, his crimes star’d him in the face, and made him believe that his distresses proceeded from the hand of God, as a just punishment. He was terrified to distraction, when Charles VIII. of France approached with a numerous army: he deserted his kingdom; and fled to hide himself from the face of God and man.

But admitting a sense of Deity, is it evidence to us that a Deity actually exists? The answer is, That it is complete evidence. So framed is man as to rely on the evidence of his senses (b); which evidence it is not in his power to reject, were he even disposed to be a sceptic. And experience confirms our belief; for our senses, when in order, never deceive us.

The foregoing sense of Deity is not the only evidence we have of his existence: there is additional evidence from other branches of our nature. Inherent in the nature of man are two passions, devotion, of which the Deity is the immediate and only object; and dread of punishment, when one is guilty of any crime. These passions would be idle and absurd, were there no Deity to be worshipped or to be dreaded: they would be illusory passions, having no object: they would be the single instance of such irregularity; and grossly irregular it would be, to be endued with passions or principles contrived for no end or purpose. Man makes a capital figure; and is the most perfect being that inhabits this earth: how then is it possible to believe, that he should be endued with passions

(a) Genesis xlii. 21. 22.

(b) See Essays on Morality and Natural Religion, part 2. sect. 3.

contradictory

contradictory to the regular and beautiful laws which govern all other things here? It is not credible. The passions mentioned, both of them, direct us to a Deity, and afford us irresistible evidence of his existence.

Thus our Maker leaves no work of his imperfect: he has revealed himself to us, in a way perfectly analagous to our nature: in the mind of every human creature, he has lighted up a lamp, which renders him visible even to the weakest sight. Nor ought it to escape observation, that here, as in every other case, the conduct of Providence to man, is uniform. It leaves him to be directed by reason, where liberty of choice is permitted: but in matters of duty, he is provided with guides less fallible than reason: in performing his duty to man, he is guided by the moral sense; in performing his duty to God, he is guided by the sense of Deity. In these mirrors, he perceives his duty intuitively.

It is no slight support to this doctrine, that if there really be a Deity, it is highly presumable, that he will reveal himself to man, fitted by nature to adore and worship him. To other animals, the knowledge of a Deity is of no importance: to man, it is of high importance. Were we totally ignorant of a Deity, this world would appear to us a mere chaos: under the government of a wise and benevolent Deity, chance is excluded; and every event, the result of established laws, is perceived to be the best on the whole. Good men submit to whatever happens, without repining, trusting that every event is ordered by divine Providence: they submit with entire resignation; and such resignation is a sovereign balsam to every misfortune.

The sense of Deity resembles our other senses, which lie dormant till a proper object present itself. When all is silent about us, the sense of hearing is dormant; and if from infancy a man were confined to a dark room, he would be as ignorant of the
sense

sense of seeing, as one born blind. Among savages, the objects that rouse the sense of Deity, are uncommon events above the power of man; an earthquake, for example, a hurricane, a total eclipse of the sun, a sudden swell of a river that prevents their escape from an impending enemy. A savage, if he be acquainted with no events but what are familiar, has no perception of superior powers; but thunder rattling in his ears, or the convulsion of an earthquake, rouses in him the sense of Deity, and directs him to some superior being as the cause of these dreadful effects. The savage, it is true, errs in ascribing to the immediate operation of a Deity, things that have a natural cause: his error however is evidence that he has a sense of Deity, no less pregnant, than when he more justly attributes to the immediate operation of Deity, the formation of man, of this earth, of all the world.

The sense of Deity, like the moral sense, makes no capital figure among savages; the perceptions of both senses being in them faint and obscure. But in the progress of nations to maturity, these senses turn more and more vigorous, so as among enlightened nations to acquire a commanding influence; leaving no doubt about right and wrong, and as little about the existence of a Deity.

The obscurity of the sense of Deity among savages, has encouraged some sceptical philosophers to deny its existence. It has been urged, That God does nothing by halves; and that if he intended to make himself known to man, the sense of Deity would produce equal conviction with that of seeing or hearing. When we argue thus about the purposes of the Almighty, we tread on slippery ground, where we seldom fail to stumble. What if it be the purpose of the Deity, to afford us but an obscure glimpse of his being and attributes? We have reason from analogy to conjecture, that this may be the case. From some particulars mentioned

mentioned above (a), it appears at least probable, that entire submission to the moral sense, would be ill-suited to man in his present state; and would prove more hurtful than beneficial. And to me it appears evident, that to be conscious of the presence of the Great God, as I am of a friend whom I hold by the hand, would be inconsistent with the part that Providence has destined me to act in this life. Reflect only on the restraint one is under, in presence of a superior, suppose the King himself: how much greater our restraint with the same lively impression of God's awful presence! Humility and veneration would leave no room for other passions: man would be no longer man; and the system of our present state would be totally subverted. Take another instance: Such a conviction of future rewards and punishments as to overcome every inordinate desire, would reduce us to the condition of a traveller in a paltry inn, having no wish but for day-light to prosecute his journey. For that very reason, it appears agreeable to the plan of Providence, that we should have but an obscure glimpse of futurity. As the same plan of Providence is visible in all, I conclude with assurance, that a certain degree of obscurity, weighs nothing against the sense of Deity, more than against the moral sense, or against a future state of rewards and punishments. Whether all men might not have been made angels, and whether more happiness might not have resulted from a different system, lie far beyond the reach of human knowledge. From what is known of the conduct of Providence, we have reason to presume, that our present state is the result of wisdom and benevolence. So much we know with certainty, that the sense we have of Deity and of moral duty, correspond accurately to the nature of man as an imperfect being; and that these senses, were they absolutely perfect, would unhinge his nature, and convert him into a very different being.

(a) Book 2. sketch 1.

A theory espoused by several writers ancient and modern, must not be overlooked; because it pretends to compose the world without a Deity; which would reduce the sense of Deity to be delusive, if it have any existence. The theory is, That the world, composed of animals, vegetables, and brute matter, is self-existent and eternal; and that all events happen by a necessary chain of causes and effects. In this theory, tho' wisdom and benevolence are conspicuous in every part, yet the great work of planning and executing the whole, is understood to have been done blindly without intelligence or contrivance. It is scarce necessary to remark, that this theory, assumed at pleasure, is highly improbable, if not absurd; and yet that it is left naked to the world without the least cover or support. But what I chiefly insist on is, that the endless number of wise and benevolent effects, display'd every where on the face of this globe, afford to us complete evidence of a wise and benevolent cause; and as these effects are far above the power of man, we necessarily ascribe them to some superior being, or in other words to the Deity (a). And this is sufficient to remove the present objection against the existence of a sense of Deity. But I am not satisfied with this partial victory. I proceed to observe, that nothing more is required but the proof of a Deity, to overturn the supposition of self-existence in a world composed of many heterogeneous parts, and of a chain of causes and effects framed without intelligence or foresight, tho' full of wisdom and contrivance in every part. For if a Deity exist, wise and powerful above all other beings, self-existence ought to be his peculiar attribute; and no person of rationality will have any hesitation in rejecting the self-existence of such a world, when so natural a supposition lies in view, as that the whole is the operation of the truly self-existent being,

(a) First sketch of this third book, sect. 1.

whose power and wisdom are fully adequate to that arduous task.

Many gross and absurd conceptions of Deity that have prevailed among rude nations, are urged by some writers as another objection against a sense of Deity. That objection shall not be overlooked; but it will be answered to better purpose, after these gross and absurd conceptions are examined; which shall be done in the chapter immediately following.

The proof of a Deity from the innate sense here explained, differs materially from what is contained in essays on morality and natural religion (a). The proof there given is founded on a chain of reasoning, altogether independent on the innate sense of Deity. Both equally produce conviction; but as a sense operates intuitively without reasoning, the sense of Deity is made a branch of human nature, in order to enlighten those who are incapable of a long chain of reasoning; and to such, who make the bulk of mankind, it is more convincing, than the most perspicuous reasoning to a philosopher.

C H A P. II.

Progress of Opinions with respect to DEITY.

THE sense of Deity, like many other delicate senses, is in favours so faint and obscure as easily to be biased from truth. Among them, the belief of many superior beings, is universal. And two causes join to produce that belief. The first is, that be-

(a) Part 2. sect. 7.

ingaccustomed to a plurality of visible objects, men, mountains, trees, cattle, and such like, they are naturally led to imagine the same plurality in things not visible; and from that slight bias, slight indeed but natural, is partly derived the system of Polytheism, universal among savages. The other is, [that savages know little of the connection between causes and effects, and still less of the order and government of this world: every event that is not familiar, appears to them singular and extraordinary; and if such event exceed human power, it is without hesitation ascribed to a superior being. But as it occurs not to a savage, nor to any person who is not a philosopher, that the many various events exceeding human power and seemingly unconnected, may all proceed from the same cause; they are readily ascribed to different beings. Pliny ascribes Polytheism to another cause, viz. the consciousness men have of their imbecility: "Our powers are confined within narrow bounds: we do not readily conceive powers in the Deity much more extensive; and we supply by number what is wanting in power." Polytheism, thus founded, is the first stage in the progress of theology; for it is embraced by the rudest savages, who have neither capacity nor inclination to pierce deeper into the nature of things.

The next stage is distinguishable from others, by a belief that all superior beings are malevolent. Man, by nature weak and helpless, is prone to fear, dreading every new object and every unusual event. Savages, having no protection against storms, tempests, or other external accidents, and having no pleasures but in gratifying hunger, thirst, and animal love, have much to fear, and little to hope. In that disconsolate condition, they attribute the bulk of their distresses to invisible beings, who in their opinion must be malevolent. This seems to have been the opinion of the Greeks in the days of Solon; as appears in a conversation between him and Cræsus King of Lydia, mentioned by

Herodotus

Herodotus in the first book of his history. "Croesus, said Solon, you ask me about human affairs; and I answer as one who thinks that all the gods are envious, and disturbers of mankind." The negroes on the coast of Guinea, dread their deities as tyrants and oppressors: having no conception of a good deity, they attribute the few blessings they receive, to the soil, to the rivers, to the trees, and to the plants. The Lithuanians continued Pagans down to the fourteenth century; and worshipped in gloomy woods, where their deities were held to reside. Their worship probably was prompted by fear, which is allied to gloominess or darkness. The people of Kamiskatka acknowledge to this day many malevolent deities, having little or no notion of a good deity. They believe the air, the water, the mountains, and the woods, to be inhabited by malevolent spirits, whom they fear and worship. The savages of Guiana ascribe to the devil even their most common diseases; nor do they ever think of another remedy, but to apply to a forcerer to drive him away. Such negroes as believe in the devil, paint his images white.

Conviction of superior beings, who, like men, are of a mixed nature, sometimes doing good, sometimes mischief, constitutes the third stage. This came to be the system of theology in Greece. The introduction of writing among the Greeks, while they were little better than savages, produced a compound of character and manners, that has not a parallel in any other nation. They were acute in science, skilful in fine arts, extremely deficient in morals, gross beyond conception in theology, and superstitious to a degree of folly; a strange jumble of exquisite sense and absurd nonsense. They held their gods to resemble men in their external figure, and to be corporeal. In the 21st book of the Iliad, Minerva with a huge stone beats Mars to the ground, whose monstrous body covered seven broad acres. As corporeal beings, they were supposed

to require the nourishment of meat, drink, and sleep. Homer mentions more than once the inviting of gods to a feast: and Pausanias reports, that in the temple of Bacchus at Athens, there were figures of clay, representing a feast given by Amphyction to Bacchus and other deities. The inhabitants of the island Java are not so gross in their conceptions, as to think that the gods eat the offerings presented to them: but it is their opinion, that a deity brings his mouth near the offering, sucks out all its savour, and leaves it tasteless like water *. The Grecian gods, as described by Homer, dress, bathe, and anoint, like mortals. Venus, after being detected by her husband in the embraces of Mars, retires to Paphos,

Where to the pow'r an hundred altars rise,
And breathing odours scent the balmy skies:
Conceal'd she bathes in consecrated bow'rs,
The Graces unguents shed, ambrosial show'rs,
Unguents that charm the gods! She last assumes
Her wondrous robes; and full the goddess blooms.

ODYSSEY, book 8.

Juno's dress is most poetically described, Iliad, book 14. It was also universally believed, that the gods were fond of women, and had many children by them. The ancient Germans thought more sensibly, that the gods were too high to resemble men in any degree, or to be confined within the walls of a temple. Led by the same impressions of deity, the Greeks seem to have thought, that the gods did not much exceed themselves in knowledge. When Agefilaus journeyed with his private retinue, he usually lodged in

* All Greek writers, and those in their neighbourhood, form the world out of a chaos. They had no such exalted notion of a deity as to believe, that he could make the world out of nothing.

a temple; making the gods witnesses, says Plutarch, of his most secret actions. The Greeks thought, that a god, like a man, might know what passed within his own house; without knowing any thing passing at a greater distance. Agamemnon, in Eschylus, putting off his travelling habit, and dressing himself in splendid purple, is afraid of being seen and envied by some jealous god. We learn from Seneca, that people strove for the seat next to the image of the deity, that their prayers might be the better heard. But what we have chiefly to remark upon this head, is, that the Grecian gods were, like men, held capable of doing both good and ill. Jupiter, their highest deity, was a ravisher of women, and a notorious adulterer. In the second book of the *Iliad*, he sends a lying dream to deceive Agamemnon. Mars seduces Venus by bribes to commit adultery (a). In the *Rhesus* of Euripides, Minerva, disguised like Venus, deceives Paris by a gross lie. The ground-work of the tragedy of *Xuthus* is a lying oracle, declaring Ion, son of Apollo and Creusa, to be the son of Xuthus. Orestes in Euripides, having slain his mother Clytemnestra, excuses himself as having been misled by Apollo to commit the crime. "Ah!" says he, "had I consulted the ghost of my father, he would have dissuaded me from a crime that has proved my ruin, without doing him any good." He concludes with observing, that having acted by Apollo's command, Apollo is the only criminal. In a tragedy of Sophocles, Minerva makes no difficulty to cheat Ajax, by promising to be his friend, while underhand she is serving Ulysses, his bitter enemy. Mercury, in revenge for the murder of his son Myrtilus, entails curses on Pelops the murderer, and on all his race*. In general, the gods, every

(b) *Odyssey*, book 8.

* The English translator of that tragedy, observes it to be remarkable in the Grecian creed, that the gods punish the crimes of men upon their innocent posterity.

where

where in Greek tragedies, are partial, unjust, tyrannical, and revengeful. The Greeks accordingly have no reserve in maltreating their gods. In the tragedy of Prometheus, Jupiter, without the least ceremony, is accused of being an usurper. Eschylus proclaims publicly on the stage, that Jupiter, a jealous, cruel, and implacable tyrant, had overturned every thing in heaven; and that the other gods were reduced to be his slaves. In the Iliad, book 13. Menelaus addresses Jupiter in the following words: "O father Jove! in wisdom, they say, thou excellest both men and gods. Yet all these ills proceed from thee; for the wicked thou dost aid in war. Thou art a friend to the Trojans, whose souls delight in force, who are never glutted with blood." The gods were often treated with a sort of contemptuous familiarity, and employed in very low offices. Nothing is more common, than to introduce them as actors in Greek tragedies; frequently for trivial purposes: Apollo comes upon the stage most courteously to acquaint the audience with the subject of the play. Why is this not urged by our critics, as classical authority against the rule of Horace, *Nec deus interfit nisi dignus vindice nodus* *. Homer makes very useful servants of his gods. Minerva, in particular, is a faithful attendant upon Ulysses. She acts the herald, and calls the chiefs to council (a). She marks the place where a great stone fell that was thrown by Ulysses (b). She assists Ulysses to hide his treasure in a cave (c), and helps him to wrestle with the beggar (d). Ulysses being tost with cares in bed, she descends

* Nor let a god in person stand display'd,

Unless the labouring plot deserve his aid.

FRANCIS.

(a) Odyssey, book 8.

(b) Book 8.

(c) Book 13.

(d) Book 18.

from

from heaven to make him fall asleep (a). This last might possibly be squeezed into an allegory, if Minerva were not frequently introduced where there is no place for an allegory. Jupiter, book 17. of the Iliad, is introduced comforting the steeds of Achilles for the death of Patroclus. It appears from Cicero (b), that when Greek philosophers began to reason about the deity, their notions were wonderfully crude. One of the hardest morsels to digest in Plato's philosophy, was his doctrine, That God is incorporeal; which by many was thought absurd, for that, without a body, he could not have senses, nor prudence, nor pleasure. The religious creed of the Romans seems to have been little less impure than that of the Greeks. It was a ceremony of theirs, in besieging a town, to evocate the tutelar deity, and to tempt him by a reward to betray his friends and votaries. In that ceremony, the name of the tutelar deity was thought of importance; and for that reason, the tutelar deity of Rome was a profound secret *. Appian

of

(a) Odyssey, book 20.

(b) Lib. 1. De natura deorum.

* The form of the *evocatio* follows. "Tuo ductu, inquit, Pythie Apollo, tuoque numine instinctus, pergo ad delendam urbem Veios: tibi que hinc decimam partem prædæ voveo. Te simul, Juno Regina, quæ nunc Veios colis, precor, ut nos victores in nostram tuamque mox futuram urbem sequare: ubi te, dignum amplitudine tua, templum accipiat." *Titus Livius, lib. 5. cap. 21.* — [*In English thus:* "Under thy guidance and divine inspiration, O Pythian Apollo, I march to the destruction of Veii; and to thy shrine I devote a tenth of the plunder. Imperial Juno, guardian of Veii, deign to prosper our victorious arms, and a temple shall be erected to thy honour, suitable to the greatness and majesty of thy name."] — But it appears from Macrobius, that they used a form of evocation even when the name of the tutelar deity was unknown to them. "Si deus, si dea est, tui populus civitasque Carthaginiensis est in tutela, teque maxime ille qui urbis hujus populique tutelam recipisti, precor, venerorque, veniamque a vobis peto, ut vos populum civitatemque Carthaginiensem deferatis, loca, templa, sacra, urbemque eorum relinquatis, absque his abeat, eique populo,

of Alexandria, in his book of the Parthian war, reports, that Anthony, reduced to extremity by the Parthians, lifted up his eyes to heaven, and besought the gods, that if any of them were jealous of his former happiness, they would pour their vengeance upon his head alone, and suffer his army to escape. The story of Paris and the three goddesses gives no favourable impression, either of the morals or religion of the Romans. Juno and her two sister-deities submit their dispute about beauty to the shepherd Paris, who conscientiously pronounces in favour of Venus. But

————— *manet alta mente repositum*

Judicium Paridis, spreteque injuria forme.

Juno, not satisfied with wreaking her malice against the honest shepherd, declares war against his whole nation. Not even Eneas, tho' a fugitive in foreign lands, escapes her fury. Their great god Jupiter is introduced on the stage by Plautus, to deceive Alcmena, and to lie with her in the shape of her husband. Nay, it was the opinion of the Romans, that this play made much for the honour of Jupiter; for in times of national troubles and calamities, it was commonly acted to appease his anger;—a most

“pulo, civitatisque metum, formidinem, oblivionem injiciatis, proditiue Romanam
“ad me meosque veneatis, nostraque vobis loca, templa, sacra, urbs, acceptior
“probatioque sit, nilique populoque Romano militibusque meis prepositi sitis,
“ut sciamus intelligamusque. Si ita feceritis, voveo vobis templa ludosque factu-
“rum.” *Saturnal. lib. 3. cap. 9.* — [*In English thus:* “That divinity, whether
“god or goddess, who is the guardian of the state of Carthage, that divinity I in-
“voke, I pray and supplicate, that he will desert that perfidious people. Honour
“not with thy presence their temples, their ceremonies, nor their city, abandon
“them to all their fears, leave them to infamy and oblivion. Fly hence to Rome,
“where, in my country, and among my fellow-citizens, thou shalt have nobler
“temples, and more acceptable sacrifices; thou shalt be the tutelar deity of this
“army, and of the Roman state. On this condition, I here vow to erect temples
“and institute games to thine honour.”]

pregnant

pregnant instance of the gross conceptions of that warlike people in morality, as well as in religion.

A division of invisible beings into benevolent and malevolent, without any mixture of these qualities, makes the fourth stage. The talents and feelings of men, refine gradually under good government: social amusements begin to make a figure: benevolence is highly regarded; and some men are found without gall. Having thus acquired a notion of pure benevolence, and finding it exemplified in some persons, it was an easy step in the progress of theological opinions, to bestow the same character upon some superior beings. This led men to distinguish their gods into two kinds, essentially different; one entirely benevolent, another entirely malevolent; and the difference between good and ill, which are diametrically opposite, favoured that distinction. Fortunate events out of the common course of nature, were accordingly ascribed to benevolent deities; and unfortunate events of that kind, to malevolent. In the time of Pliny the elder, malevolent deities were worshipped at Rome. He mentions a temple dedicated to *Bad Fortune*, another to the disease termed a *Fever*. The Lacedemonians worshipped *Death* and *Fear*; and the people of Cadiz *Poverty* and *Old Age*; in order to deprecate their wrath. Such gods were by the Romans termed *Averrunci*, as putting away evil.

Conviction of one supreme benevolent Deity, and of inferior deities, some benevolent, some malevolent, is the fifth stage. Such conviction, which gains ground in proportion as morality ripens, arises from a remarkable difference between gratitude and fear. Willing to show my gratitude for some kindness proceeding from an unknown hand, several persons occur to my conjectures; but I always fix at last upon one person as the most likely. Fear is of an opposite nature: it expands itself upon every suspicious person, and blackens them all equally. Thus, upon providential good fortune above the power of man, we nat-

turally rest upon one benevolent Deity as the cause; and to him we confine our gratitude and veneration; When, on the other hand, we are struck with an uncommon calamity, every thing that possibly may be the cause, raises terror in us. Hence the propensity in savages to multiply objects of fear; but to confine their gratitude and veneration to a single object. Gratitude and veneration, at the same time, are of such a nature, as to raise a high opinion of the person who is their object; and when a single invisible being is understood to pour out blessings with a liberal hand, good men, inflamed with gratitude, put no bounds to the power and benevolence of that being. And thus one supreme benevolent Deity comes to be recognised among the more enlightened savages. With respect to malevolent deities, as they are supposed to be numerous, and as there is no natural impulse for elevating one above another, they are all of them held to be of an inferior rank, subordinate to the supreme Deity.

Unity in the supreme being hath, among philosophers, a more solid foundation, viz. unity of design and of order in the creation and government of this world *. At the same time, the passion of gratitude, which leads even savages to the attribute of unity in the supreme being, prepares the mind for relishing the proof of that unity, founded on the unity of his works.

The belief of one supreme benevolent Deity, and of subordinate deities benevolent and malevolent, is and has been more universal than any other religious creed. I confine myself to a few in-

* All things in the universe are evidently of a piece. Every thing is adjusted to every thing; one design prevails through the whole: and this uniformity leads the mind to acknowledge one author; because the conception of different authors without distinction of attributes or operations, serves only to perplex the imagination, without bestowing any satisfaction on the understanding. *Natural history of Religion, by David Hume, Esquire.*

stances;

stances ; for a complete enumeration would be endless. The different savage tribes in Dutch Guiana, agree pretty much in their articles of faith. They hold the existence of one supreme Deity, whose chief attribute is benevolence ; and to him they ascribe every good that happens. But as it is against his nature to do ill, they believe in subordinate malevolent beings, like our devil, who occasion thunder, hurricanes, earthquakes, and who are the authors of death, diseases, and of every misfortune. To these devils, termed in their language *Rowaboos*, they direct every supplication, in order to avert their malevolence ; while the supreme Deity is entirely neglected : so much more powerful among savages, is fear than gratitude. The North-American savages have all of them a notion of a supreme Deity, creator and governor of the world, and of inferior deities, some good, some ill. These are supposed to have bodies, and to live much as men do, but without being subjected to any distress. The same creed prevails among the negroes of Benin and Congo, among the people of New Zeland, among the inhabitants of Java, of Madagascar, of the Molucca islands, and of the Caribbee islands. The Chingulense, a tribe in the island of Ceylon, acknowledge one God creator of the universe, with subordinate deities who act as his deputies : agriculture is the peculiar province of one, navigation of another. The creed of the Tonquinese is nearly the same. The inhabitants of Otaheite, termed *King George's island*, believe in one supreme Deity ; and in inferior deities without end, who preside over particular parts of the creation. They pay no adoration to the supreme Deity, thinking him too far elevated above his creatures to concern himself with what they do. They believe the stars to be children of the sun and moon, and an eclipse to be the time of copulation. According to Arnobius, certain Roman deities presided over the various operations of men. Venus presided over carnal copulation ; Puta assisted at pruning trees ; and

Peta in requesting benefits ; Nemeſtrinus was god of the woods, Nodutus ripened corn, and Terenſis helped to thresh it ; Vibilia aſſiſted travellers ; orphans were under the care of Orbona, and dying perſons, of Nænia ; Oſſilago hardened the bones of infants ; and Mellonia protected bees, and beſtow'd ſweetneſs on their honey. The inhabitants of the iſland of Formoſa recogniſe two ſupreme deities in company ; the one a male, god of the men, the other a female, goddeſs of the women. The bulk of their inferior deities are the ſouls of upright men, who are conſtantly doing good, and the ſouls of wicked men, who are conſtantly doing ill. The inland negroes acknowledge one ſupreme being, creator of all things ; attributing to him infinite power, infinite knowledge, and ubiquity. They believe that the dead are converted into ſpirits, termed by them *Iananini*, or protectors, being appointed to guard their parents and relations. The ancient Goths, and ſeveral other northern nations, acknowledged one ſupreme being ; and at the ſame time worſhipped three ſubordinate deities ; Thor, reputed the ſame with Jupiter ; Oden, or Woden, the ſame with Mars ; and Friga, the ſame with Venus *. Socrates, taking the cup of poiſon from the executioner, held it up toward heaven, and pouring out ſome of it as an oblation to the ſupreme Deity, pronounced the following prayer : “ I implore the immortal God “ that my tranſlation hence may be happy.” Then turning to Crito, ſaid, “ O Crito ! I owe a cock to Eſculapius, pay it.” From this incident we find that Socrates, ſoaring above his countrymen, had attained to the belief of a ſupreme benevolent Deity. But in that dark age of religion, ſuch purity is not to be expected from

* *Regnator omnium Deus, cætera ſubjecta atque parentia ; Tacitus de moribus Germanorum, cap. 39.* [In Engliſh thus : “ One God the ruler of all ; the reſt “ inferior and ſubordinate.”]

Socrates himself, as to have rejected subordinate deities, even of the mercenary kind.

Different offices being assigned to the gods, as above mentioned, proper names followed of course. And when a god was ascertained by a name, the busy mind would naturally proceed to trace his genealogy.

As unity in the Deity was not an established doctrine in the countries where the Christian religion was first promulgated, Christianity could not fail to prevail over Paganism; for improvements in the mental faculties lead by sure steps, tho' slow, to one God.

The sixth stage is, the belief of one supreme benevolent Deity, as in that immediately foregoing, with many inferior benevolent deities, and one only who is malevolent. As men improve in natural knowledge, and become skilful in tracing causes from effects, they find much less malice and ill-design than was imagined: humanity at last prevails, which, in connection with improved knowledge, banishes the suspicion of ill-design, in every case where an event can possibly be explained without it. In a word, a settled opinion of good prevailing in the world, produced conviction among some nations, less ignorant than their neighbours, and less brutal, that there is but one malevolent subordinate deity, and good subordinate deities without number. The ancient Persians acknowledged two principles; one all good and all powerful, named *Hormuz*, and by the Greeks corruptly *Oromazes*; the other evil, named *Ahariman*, and by the Greeks *Arimanes*. Some authors assert, that the Persians held these two principles to be co-eternal: others, that Oromazes first subsisted alone, that he created both light and darkness, and that he created Arimanes out of darkness. That the latter was the opinion of the ancient Persians, appears from their Bible, termed the *Sadder*; which teaches, That there is one God supreme over all, many good angels, and but

one

one evil spirit. Plutarch acquaints us, that Hormuz and Ahari-man, for ever at variance, formed, each of them, creatures of their own stamp; that the former created good genii, such as goodness, truth, wisdom, justice; and that the latter created evil genii, such as infidelity, falsehood, oppression, theft. This system of theology, commonly termed the *Manichean system*, is said to be also the religious creed of Pegu, with the following addition, that the evil principle only is to be worshipped; which is abundantly probable, as fear is a predominant passion in barbarians. The people of Florida believe a supreme benevolent Deity, and a subordinate deity that is malevolent: neglecting the former, who, they say, does no harm, they bend their whole attention to soften the latter, who, they say, torments them day and night. The inhabitants of Darien acknowledge but one evil spirit, of whom they are desperately afraid. The Hottentots, mentioned by some writers as altogether destitute of religion, are, on the contrary, farther advanced toward its purity, than some of their neighbours. Their creed is, That there is a supreme being, who is goodness itself; of whom they have no occasion to stand in awe, as he is incapable by his nature to hurt them; that there is also a malevolent spirit, subordinate to the former, who must be served and worshipped in order to avert his malice. The Epicurean doctrine with respect to the gods in general, That being happy in themselves, they extend not their providential care to men, differs not widely from what the Hottentot believes with respect to the supreme being.

Having traced the sense of deity, from its dawn in the grossest savages, to its approaching maturity among enlightened nations, we proceed to the last stage of the progress, which makes the true system of theology; and that is, conviction of a supreme being, boundless in every perfection, without any subordinate deities, benevolent or malevolent. Savages learn early to trace the chain
of

of causes and effects, with respect to ordinary events: they know that fasting produces hunger, that labour occasions weariness, that fire burns, that the sun and rain contribute to vegetation. But when they go beyond such familiar events, they lose sight of cause and effect: the changes of weather, of winds, of heat and cold, impress them with a notion of chance: earthquakes, hurricanes, storms of thunder and lightning, which fill them with terror, are ascribed to malignant beings of greater power than man. In the progress of knowledge, light begins to break in upon them: they discover, that such phenomena, however tremendous, come under the general law of cause and effect, and that there is no ground for ascribing them to malignant spirits. At the same time, our more refined senses ripen by degrees: social affections come to prevail, and morality makes a deep impression. In maturity of sense and understanding, benevolence appears more and more; and beautiful final causes are discovered in many of nature's productions, that formerly were thought useless, or perhaps destructive: and the time may come, we have solid ground to hope that it will come, when doubts and difficulties about the government of Providence, will all of them be cleared up; and every event be found conducive to the general good. Such views of Providence banish malevolent deities; and we settle at last in a most comfortable opinion; either that there are no such beings; or that, if they exist and are permitted to perpetrate any mischief, it is in order to produce greater good. Thus, through a long maze of errors, man arrives at true religion, acknowledging but one Being, supreme in power, intelligence, and benevolence, who created all other beings, to whom all other beings are subjected, and who directs every event to answer the best purposes. This system is true theology*.

Having

* Pliny seems to relish the doctrine of unity in the Deity; but is at a loss about forming.

Having gone through the different stages of religious belief, in its gradual progress toward truth and purity, I proceed to a very important article, viz. The history of tutelar deities. The belief of tutelar deities preceded indeed several of the stages mentioned, witness the tutelar deities of Greece and Rome; but as it is not connected with any one of them exclusive of the rest, the clearness of method required it to be postponed to all of them. This belief, founded on selfishness, made a rapid progress after property in the goods of fortune was established. The Greeks, the Romans, and indeed most nations that were not mere savages, appropriated to themselves tutelar deities, who were understood to befriend them upon all occasions; and, in particular, to fight for them against their enemies. The Iliad of Homer is full of miraculous battles between the Greeks and Trojans, the tutelar deities mixing with the contending parties, and partaking of every disaster, death only excepted, which immortals could not suffer. The *lares*, *penates*, or household-gods, of Indostan, of Greece, and of Rome, bear witness, that every family, perhaps every person, was thought to be under the protection of a tutelar deity. Alexander ab Alexandro gives a list of tutelar deities. Apollo and Minerva were the tutelar deities of Athens; Bacchus and Hercules of the Bœotian Thebes; Juno of Carthage, Samos, Sparta, Argos, and Mycené; Venus of Cyprus; Apollo of Rhodes, and of Delphos; Vulcan of Lemnos; Bacchus of Naxos; Neptune of Tenedos, &c. The poets testify, that even individuals had tutelar deities:

Mulciber in Trojam, pro Troja stabat Apollo:

Æqua Venus Teucris, Pallas iniqua fuit.

Oderat Æneam, propior Saturnia Turno;

Ille tamen Veneris numine tutus erat.

forming any just conception of him, sometimes considering the world to be our only deity, sometimes the sun.

Sæpe

Sæpe ferox cautum petiit Neptunus Ulyssæ;

Eripuit patruo sæpe Minerva suo * (a).

Though the North-American savages recognise a supreme Being, wise and benevolent, and also subordinate benevolent beings who are intrusted with the government of the world; yet as the great distance of these subordinate beings, and the full occupation they have in general government, are supposed to make them overlook individuals, every man has a tutelar deity of his own, termed *Manitou*, who is constantly invoked during war to give him victory over his enemies. The Natches, bordering on the Mississippi, offer up the skulls of their enemies to their god, and deposit them in his temple. They consider that being as their tutelar deity who assists them against their enemies, and to whom therefore the skull of an enemy must be an acceptable offering. Tho' they worship the sun, who impartially shines on all mankind; yet such is their partiality, that they consider themselves as his chosen people, and that their enemies are his enemies.

A belief so absurd shows woful imbecility in human nature. Is it not obvious, that the great God of heaven and earth, governs the world by inflexible laws, from which he never can swerve in any case, because they are the best possible in every case? To suppose any family or nation to be an object of his peculiar love, is no less impious, than to suppose any family or nation to be an

* "The rage of Vulcan, and the martial maid,

"Pursu'd old Troy; but Phœbus' love repay'd.

"Æneas safe, defy'd great Juno's hate,

"For Venus guards her favour'd offspring's fate:

"In vain Ulysses Neptune's wrath assails,

"O'er winds and waves Minerva's power prevails."

(a) Ovid. Trist. lib. 1. eleg. 2.

object of his peculiar hatred : they equally arraign Providence of partiality. Even the Goths had more just notions of the Deity. Totila, recommending to his people justice and humanity, says, " Quare sic habete, ea quæ amari ab hominibus solent ita vobis
 " salva fore, si justitiæ reverentiam servaveritis. Si transitis in
 " mores alios, etiam Deum ad hostes transiturum. Neque enim
 " ille, aut omnibus omnino hominibus, aut uni alicui genti, ad-
 " dicit se socium *."

That God was once the tutelar deity of the Jews, is true ; but not in the vulgar acceptation of that term, importing a deity chosen by a people to be their patron and protector. The orthodox faith is, " That God chose the Jews as his peculiar people, not
 " from any partiality to them, but that there might be one nation
 " to keep alive the knowledge of one supreme Deity ; which should
 " be prosperous while they adhered to him, and unprosperous when
 " they declined to idolatry ; not only in order to make them persevere
 " in the true faith, but also in order to exemplify to all nations the
 " conduct of his Providence." It is certain, however, that the perverse Jews claimed God Almighty as their tutelar deity, in the vulgar acceptation of the term. And this error throws light upon an incident related in the Acts of the Apostles. There was a prophecy firmly believed by the Jews, that the Messiah would come among them in person to restore their kingdom. The Christians gave a different sense to the prophecy, viz. that the kingdom promised was not of this world. And they said, that Christ was sent to pave

* " Be assured of this, that while ye preserve your reverence for justice, ye will
 " enjoy all the blessings which are estimable among mankind. If ye refuse to obey
 " her dictates, and your morals become corrupted, God himself will abandon you,
 " and take the part of your enemies. For altho' the benevolence of that power
 " is not partially confined to tribe or people, yet in the eye of his justice all men
 " are not equally the objects of his approbation."

the

the way to their heavenly kingdom, by obtaining forgiveness of their sins. At the same time, as the Jews held all other nations in abhorrence, it was natural for them to conclude, that the Messiah would be sent to them only, God's chosen people; for which reason, even the apostles were at first doubtful about preaching the gospel to any but to the Jews (a). But the apostles reflecting, that it was one great purpose of the mission, to banish from the Jews their groveling and impure notion of a tutelar deity, and to proclaim a state of future happiness to all who believe in Christ, they proceeded to preach the gospel to all men: "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive, that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him (b)." The foregoing reasoning, however, did not satisfy the Jews: they could not digest the opinion, that God sent his Messiah to save all nations; and that he was the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. They stormed against Paul in particular for inculcating that doctrine (c).

Considering that religion in its purity was established by the gospel, is it not amazing, that even Christians fell back to the worship of tutelar deities? They did not indeed adopt the absurd opinion, that the supreme Being was their tutelar deity: but they held, that there are divine persons subordinate to the Almighty, who take under their care nations, families, and even individuals; an opinion that differs not essentially from that of tutelar deities among the Heathens. That opinion, which flatters self-love, took root in the fifth century, when the deification of saints was introduced, similar to the deification of heroes among the an-

(a) See the 10th and 11th chapters of the Acts of the Apostles.

(b) Acts of the Apostles, x. 34.

(c) Acts of the Apostles, chap. 13.

cients. With regard to matters spiritual, as well as temporal, people are fond of friends to be their intercessors; and with regard to the Deity, deified saints were thought the properest intercessors. Temples were built and dedicated to them, and solemn rites of worship instituted to render them propitious. It was imagined, that the souls of deified saints are at liberty to roam where they list, and that they love the places where their bodies are interred; which accordingly made the sepulchres of the saints a common rendezvous of supplicants. What paved the way to notions so absurd, was the gross ignorance that clouded the Christian world after the northern barbarians became masters of Europe. In the seventh century, the bishops were so illiterate, as to be indebted to others for the shallow sermons they preached; and the very few of that order who had any learning, satisfied themselves with composing insipid homilies, collected from the writings of Augustin and Gregory. In the ninth century, matters grew worse and worse; for these saints, held at first to be mediators for Christians in general, were now converted into tutelar deities in the strictest sense. An opinion prevailed, that such saints as are occupied about the souls of Christians in general, have little time for individuals; which led every church, and every private Christian, to elect for themselves a particular saint, as their peculiar patron or tutelar deity. That practice made it necessary to deify saints without end, in order to furnish a tutelar deity to every individual. The dubbing of saints, became a new source of abuses and frauds in the Christian world: lying wonders were invented and fabulous histories composed, to celebrate exploits that never were performed, and to glorify persons that never had a being. And thus religion among Christians, sunk down into as low a state as it had been among Pagans.

There still remains upon hand a capital branch of our history; and that is idolatry, which properly signifies the worshipping visible

fible objects as deities. But as idolatry evidently sprung from religious worship, corrupted by the ignorant and brutish, it will make its appearance with more advantage in the next section, of which religious worship is the subject.

We have thus traced with wary steps, the gradual progress of theology through many stages, corresponding to the gradual openings and improvements of the human mind. But tho' that progress in almost all countries appears uniform with respect to the order of succession, it is far otherwise with respect to the quickness of succession: nations, like individuals, make a progress from infancy to maturity; but they advance not with an equal pace, some making a rapid course toward perfection in knowledge and in religion, while others remain ignorant barbarians. The religion of Hindostan, if we credit history or tradition, had advanced to a considerable degree of purity and refinement, at a very early period. The Hindostan Bible, termed *Chatthbade* or *Shastab*, gives an account of the creation, lapse of the angels, and creation of man; instructs us in the unity of the Deity, but denies his prescience as being inconsistent with free-will in man; all of them profound doctrines of an illuminated people; to establish which a long course of time must have been requisite, after wandering through errors without number. Compared with the Hindows in theology, even the Greeks were mere savages. The Grecian gods were held to be little better than men, and their history, as above mentioned, corresponds to the notion entertain'd of them.

In explaining the opinions of men with respect to Deity, I have confined my view to such opinions as are suggested by principles or biases that make a part of common nature; omitting many whimsical notions, no better than dreams of a roving imagination. The plan delineated shows wonderful uniformity in the progress of religion through all nations. That the whimsical notions

tions

tions mentioned are far otherwise, is not wonderful. Take the following specimen. The Kamskatkans are not so stupidly ignorant, as to be altogether void of curiosity. They sometimes think of natural appearances. — Rain, say they, is some deity pissing upon them; and they imagine the rainbow to be a party-coloured garment, put on by him in preparing for that operation. They believe wind to be produced by a god shaking his long hair about his head with violence. Such tales will scarce amuse children in the nursery. The inhabitants of the island Celebes formerly acknowledged no gods but the sun and the moon, which were held to be eternal. Ambition for superiority made them fall out. The moon being wounded in flying from the sun, was delivered of the earth.

Hitherto of the gradual openings of the human mind with respect to Deity. I close this section with an account of some unfound notions concerning the conduct of Providence, and concerning some speculative matters. I begin with the former.

In days of ignorance, the conduct of Providence is very little understood. Far from having any notion, that the government of this world is carried on by general laws, which are inflexible because they are the best possible, every important event is attributed to an immediate interposition of the Deity. As the Grecian gods were thought to have bodies like men, and like men to require nourishment; they were imagined to act like men, forming short-sighted plans of operation, and varying them from time to time according to exigencies. Even the wise Athenians, had an utter aversion at philosophers who attempted to account for effects by general laws: such doctrine they thought tended to fetter the gods, and to prevent them from governing events at their pleasure. An eclipse being held to be a prognostic given by the gods of some grievous calamity, Anaxagoras was accused of Atheism for attempting to explain the eclipse of the moon by natural causes;

ses: he was thrown into prison, and with difficulty was relieved by the influence of Pericles. Protagoras was banished Athens for maintaining the same doctrine. Procopius overflows with signal interpositions of Providence; and Agathias, beginning at the battle of Marathon, sagely maintains, that from that time downward, there was not a battle lost, but by an immediate judgment of God, for the sins of the commander, or of his army, or of one person or other. Our Saviour's doctrine with respect to those who suffered by the fall of the tower of Siloam, ought to have opened their eyes; but superstitious eyes are never opened by instruction. At the same time, it is deplorable that such belief has no good influence on manners: on the contrary, never doth wickedness so much abound as in dark times. A curious fact is related by Procopius (a) with respect to that sort of superstition. When Rome was besieged by the Goths, and in danger of destruction, a part of the town-wall, declining from the perpendicular, was in a tottering condition. Belisarius, proposing to fortify it, was opposed by the citizens, affirming, that it was guarded by St Peter. Procopius observes, that the event answered expectation; for that the Goths, during a tedious siege, never once attempted that weak part. He adds, that the wall remained in the same ruinous state at the time of his writing. Here is a curious conceit:—Peter created a tutelar deity, able and willing, for the sake of his votaries, to counteract the laws by which God governs the material world. And for what mighty benefit to them? Only to save them five or fifty pounds in rebuilding the crazy part of the wall.

It is no less inconsistent with the regular course of Providence, to believe, as many formerly did, that in all doubtful cases the Almighty, when appealed to, never fails to interpose in favour of

(a) *Historia Gothica*, lib. i.

the right side. The inhabitants of Constantinople, ann. 1284, being split into parties about two contending patriarchs, the Emperor ordered a fire to be made in the church of St Sophia, and a memorial from each party to be thrown into it; never doubting, but that God would save from the flames the memorial of the party whose cause he espoused. But, to the utter astonishment of all beholders, the flames paid not the least regard to either of the memorials. The same absurd opinion gave birth to the trial by fire, by water, and by singular battle. And it is not a little remarkable, that such trials were common among many nations that had no intercourse one with another: even the enlightened people of Indostan try crimes by dipping the hand of a suspected person in boiling oil. — Such uniformity is there with respect even to superstitious opinions. Pope Gregory VII. insisting, that the Kings of Castile and Aragon should lay aside their Gothic liturgy for the Romish, the matter was put to trial by singular battle; and two champions were chosen, to declare by victory the opinion of God Almighty. The Emperor Otho I. observing the doctors to differ about a point of law, viz. the right of representation in land-estates, appointed a duel; and the right of representation gain'd the victory. If any thing can render such a doctrine palatable, it is the believing in a tutelar deity, who with less absurdity may interpose in behalf of a favourite opinion, or of a favourite people. Appian gravely reports, that when the city of Rhodes was besieged by Mithridates, a statue of the goddess Isis was seen to dart flames of fire upon a bulky engine, raised by the besiegers to overtop the wall.

Historians mention an incident that happened in the island Celebes, founded on a belief of the same kind with that above mentioned. About two centuries ago, some Christian and some Mahometan missionaries made their way to that island. The chief king, struck with the fear of hell taught by both, assembled

a general council; and extending his hands toward heaven, addressed the following prayer to the supreme being. "Great God, from thee I demand nothing but justice, and to me thou owest it. Men of different religions have come to this island, threatening eternal punishment to me and my people if we disobey thy laws. What are thy laws? Speak, O my God, who art the author of nature: thou knowest the bottom of our hearts, and that we can never intentionally disobey thee. But if it be unworthy of thy essence to employ the language of men, I call upon my whole people, the sun which gives me light, the earth which bears me, the sea which surrounds my empire, and upon thee thyself, to bear witness for me, that in the sincerity of my heart I wish to know thy will; and this day I declare, that I will acknowledge as the depositaries of thy oracles, the first ministers of either religion that shall land on this island."

It is equally erroneous to believe, that certain ceremonies will protect one from mischief. In the dark ages of Christianity, the signing with the figure of a cross, was held not only to be an antidote against the snares of malignant spirits, but to inspire resolution for supporting trials and calamities: for which reason no Christian in those days undertook any thing of moment, till he had used that ceremony. It was firmly believed in France, that a gold or silver coin of St Louis, hung from the neck, was a protection against all diseases: and we find accordingly a hole in every remaining coin of that king, for fixing it to a riband. In the minority of Charles VIII. of France, the three estates, ann. 1484, supplicated his Majesty, that he would no longer defer the being anointed with the holy oil, as the favour of Heaven was visibly connected with that ceremony. They affirmed, that his grandfather Charles VII. never prospered till he was anointed; and that Heaven afterward fought on his side, till the English were expelled out of his kingdom. The high altar of St Margaret's

church in the island of Icolmkill, was covered with a plate of blue marble finely veined; which has suffered from a superstitious conceit, that the smallest bit of it will preserve a ship from sinking. It has accordingly been carried off piece-meal; and at present there is scarce enough left to make an experiment. In the Sadder, certain prayers are enjoined when one sneezes or pisses, in order to chase away the devil. Cart-wheels in Lisbon, are composed of two boards clumsily cut in a circular form, and nailed together. Tho' the noise is intolerable, yet the axles are never greased, because the noise, say they, frightens the devil from hurting their oxen.

Nay, so far has superstition been carried, as to found a belief, that the devil by magic can control the course of Providence. A Greek bishop having dreamed, that a certain miracle had failed by magic, the supposed magician and his son were condemned to die, without the least evidence but the dream. Montesquieu collects a number of circumstances, each of which, tho' all extremely improbable, ought to have been clearly made out, in order to prove the crime (a). The Emperor Theodore Lascaris, imagining magic to be the cause of his distemper, put the persons suspected to the trial of holding a red-hot iron without being burnt. In the capitularies of Charlemagne, in the canons of several councils, and in the ancient laws of Norway, punishments are enacted against those who are supposed able to raise tempests, termed *Tempestarii*. During the time of Catharine de Medicis, in the court of France there was a jumble of politics, gallantry, luxury, debauchery, superstition, and Atheism. It was common to take the resemblance of enemies in wax, in order to torment them by roasting the figure at a slow fire, and pricking it with needles. If

(a) L'Esprit des loix, lib. 12. ch. 5. an

an enemy happened in one instance of a thousand to pine and die, the charm was established for ever. Sorcery and witchcraft were so universally believed in England, that in a preamble to a statute of Henry VIII. ann. 1511, it is set forth, "That smiths, weavers, and women, boldly take upon them great cures, in which they partly use forcery and witchcraft." The first printers, who were Germans, having carried their books to Paris for sale, were condemned by the parliament to be burnt alive as forcerers; and did not escape punishment but by a precipitant flight. It had indeed much the appearance of forcery, that a man could write so many copies of a book, without the slightest variation. There are many examples of extraordinary virtue being attributed to certain things, in themselves of no significance. The Hungarians were possessed of a golden crown, sent from heaven with the peculiar virtue, as they believed, of bestowing upon the person who wore it, an undoubted title to be their king. But the most extraordinary effort of absurd superstition, is a persuasion, that one may control the course of Providence, by making a downright bargain with God Almighty to receive from him *quid pro quo*. A herd of Tartars in Siberia, named by the Russians *Bardvinskoi*, have in every hut a wooden idol, termed in their language *Sheitan*, about eighteen inches high, to which they address their prayers for plenty of game in hunting, promising to give it, if successful, a new coat or a new bonnet: a sort of bargain abundantly brutish; and yet more excusable in mere savages, than what is made with the Virgin Mary by enlightened Roman Catholics; who, upon condition of her relieving them from distress, promise her a waxen taper to burn on her altar. Philip II. of Spain made a vow, that, upon condition of gaining the battle of St Quintin, he would build the monastery of Escorial; as if an establishment for some idle monks, could be a motive with

the great God to vary the course of his Providence *. Beside the absurdity of thinking that such vows can have the effect to alter the established laws of Providence, they betray a most contemptible notion of the Deity, as if his favours, like a horse or a cow, could be purchased with money.

But however loose and disjointed, events appear to the ignorant, when viewed as past, or as passing, future events take on a very different appearance. The doctrine of prognostics is evidently founded upon a supposition, that future events are unalterably fixed; for otherwise that doctrine would appear absurd, even to the most ignorant. There is no bias in human nature that has greater influence, than curiosity about futurity; which in dark ages governs without control: men with no less folly than industry have ransacked the earth, the sea, the air, and even the stars, for prognostics of future events. The Greeks had their oracles, the Romans their augurs, and all the world their omens. The Grecian oracles and the Roman auguries are evidently built upon their belief of tutelar deities; and the numberless omens that influence weak people in every country, seem to rest upon the same foundation †. Ancient histories are stuffed with omens, prodig-

* Having gained the battle of St Quintin on the festival of St Laurence, Philip reckoned himself obliged to the saint for this victory, no less than to God Almighty; and accordingly, he not only built the monastery he had vowed, but also a church for the saint and a palace for himself, all under one roof: and what is not a little ludicrous, the edifice is built in resemblance of a gridiron, which, according to the legend, was the instrument of Laurence's martyrdom.

† It is no wonder that the Romans were superstitiously addicted to omens and auguries: like mere savages, they put no value upon any science but that of war; and, for that reason, they banished all philosophers, as useless members of society. Thus, that nation, so fierce and so great in war, surrendered themselves blindly to superstition, and became slaves to imaginary evils. Even their gravest historians were deeply tainted with that disease.

gies,

gies, and prognostics: Livy overflows with fooleries of that kind. Endless are the adverse omens reported by Appian of Alexandria, that are said to have given warning of the defeat of Crassus by the Parthians; and no fewer in number are those which happened at the death of the Emperor Hadrian, if we believe Spartianus. Lampridius, with great gravity, recites the omens which prognosticated that Alexander Severus would be Emperor: he was born the same day on which Alexander the Great died: he was brought forth in a temple dedicated to Alexander the Great: he was named *Alexander*; and an old woman gave to his mother, a pigeon's egg of a purple colour produced on his birthday. A comet is an infallible prognostic of the death of a king. But of what king? Why, of the king who dies next. Suetonius, with the solemnity of a pulpit-instructor, informs us, that the death of the Emperor Claudius was predicted by a comet; and of Tiberius, by the fall of a tower during an earthquake. Such opinions, which indeed have some foundation in our nature, take fast hold of the mind, when enervated by education and example. Even philosophy is not sufficient to eradicate them but by slow degrees: witness Tacitus, the most profound of all historians, who cannot forbear to usher in the death of the Emperor Otho, with a foolish account of a strange unknown bird appearing at that time. He indeed, with decent reserve, mentions it only as a fact reported by others; but from the warm style of his narrative it is evident, that the story had made an impression upon him. The ancient Germans drew many of their omens from horses: " *Proprium gentis, equorum*
 " *presagia ac monitus experiri. Publice aluntur iisdem nemo-*
 " *ribus ac lucis, candide, et nullo mortali opere contacti, quos*
 " *pressos sacro curru, sacerdos, ac rex, vel princeps civitatis, comi-*
 " *tantur, hinnitusque ac fremitus observant. Nec ulli auspicio*
 " *major fides, non solum apud plebem, sed apud procures, apud*
 " *sacerdotes.*

"sacerdotes * (a)." There is scarce a thing seen or imagined, but what the inhabitants of Madagascar consider as a prognostic of some future event. The Hindows rely on the augury of birds, precisely as the old Romans did. Tho' there is not the slightest probability, that an impending misfortune was ever prevented by such prognostics; yet the desire of knowing future events is so deeply rooted in our nature, that omens will always prevail among the vulgar, in spite of the clearest light of philosophy †.

With respect to prophecies in particular, one apology may be made for them, that no other prognostic of futurity is less apt to do mischief. What Procopius (b) observes of the Sybilline oracles, is equally applicable to prophecies in general, "That it is above the sagacity of man to explain any of them before the event happen." After perusing many, he gives the following reason. "Matters are there handled," says he, "not in any order, nor in a continued discourse: but after mentioning the distresses of Africa, for example, they give a slight touch at the Persians, the Romans, the Assyrians; then returning to the Romans, they

* "It is peculiar to that people, to deduce omens and presages from horses. These animals are maintained at the public expence, in groves and forests, and are not allowed to be polluted with any work for the use of man; but being yoked in the sacred chariot, the priest, and the king, or chief of the state, attend them, and carefully observe their neighings. The greatest faith is given to this method of augury, both among the vulgar and the nobles."

† Is it not mortifying to human pride, that a great philosopher [Bacon] should think like the vulgar upon this subject? Mentioning great rejoicings in London upon the daughter of Henry VII. of England being married to James IV. of Scotland, he adds, "not from any affection to the Scots, but from a secret instinct and inspiration of the advantages that would accrue from the match."

(a) Tacitus, De moribus Germanorum, cap. 10.

(b) Gothica Historia, lib. 1.

"fall

“fall flap-dash upon the calamities of Britain.” A curious example of this observation, is a book of prophecies composed in Scotland by Thomas Learmont, commonly called *Thomas the Rhymer*, because the book is in rhyme. Plutarch, in the life of Cicero, reports, that a spectre appeared to Cicero’s nurse, and foretold, that the child would become a great support to the Roman state; and most innocently he makes the following reflection: “This might have passed for an idle tale, had not Cicero demonstrated the truth of the prediction;” which in effect is saying, that if a prediction happen to prove true, it is a real prophecy; if otherwise, that it is an idle tale. There have been prophecies not altogether so well guarded as the Sybilline oracles. Napier, inventor of the logarithms, found the day of judgement predicted in the Revelation; and named the very day; which unfortunately he survived. He made another prediction, but prudently named a day so distant, as to be in no hazard of blushing a second time. Michel Stifels, a German clergyman, spent most of his life in attempting to discover the day of judgement; and at last announced to his parishioners, that it would happen within a year. The parishioners, resolving to make the best of a bad bargain, spent their time merrily, taking no care to lay up provisions for another year; and so nice was their calculation, as at the end of the year to have not a morsel remaining, either of food or of industry. The famous Jurieu has shown great ingenuity in explaining prophecies; of which take the following instance. In his book, intitled, *Accomplishment of the prophecies*, he demonstrates, that the beast in the Apocalypse, which held the *poculum aureum plenum abominationum* *, is the Pope; and his reason is, that the initial letters of these four Latin words compose the word *papa*; a very singular prophecy indeed, that is a prophecy

* “The golden cup full of abominations.”

in Latin, but in no other language. The candid reader will advert, that such prophecies as relate to our Saviour, and tend to ascertain the truth of his mission, fall not under the foregoing reasoning; for they do not anticipate futurity, by producing foreknowledge of future events. They were not understood till our Saviour appeared among men; and then they were clearly understood as relative to him.

There is no end of superstition in its various modes. It was believed universally in dark times, that by certain forms and invocations, the spirits of the dead could be called upon to reveal future events. A lottery in Florence, gainful to the government, and ruinous to the people, gives great scope to superstition. The purchaser of tickets, in order to be successful, must fast six and thirty hours, must repeat a certain number of Ave Marias and Pater Nosters, must not speak to a living creature, must not go to bed, must continue in prayer to the Virgin, and to saints, till some propitious saint appear and declare the numbers that are to be successful. The ticket-holder, fatigued with fasting, praying, and expectation, falls asleep. Occupied with the thoughts he had when awake, he dreams that a saint appears, and mentions the numbers that are to be successful. If he be disappointed, he is vexed at his want of memory; but trusts in the saint as an infallible oracle. Again he buys tickets, again falls asleep, again sees a vision, and again is disappointed.

Lucky and unlucky days, which were so much rely'd on as even to be marked in the Greek and Roman calendars, make an appendix to prophecies. The Tartars never undertake any thing of moment on a Wednesday, being held by them unlucky. The Nogayan Tartars hold every thirteenth year to be unlucky: they will not even wear a sword that year, believing that it would be their death; and they maintain, that none of their warriors ever returned who went upon an expedition in one of these years. They
pass

pass that time in fasting and prayer, and during it never marry. The inhabitants of Madagascar have days fortunate and unfortunate with respect to the birth of children: they destroy without mercy every child that is born on an unfortunate day.

I close this important article with a reflection that ought to make an impression upon every rational mind. The knowledge of future events, as far as it tends to influence our conduct, is inconsistent with a state of trial, such as Providence has allotted to man in this life. It would deprive him of hopes and fears, and leave him nothing to deliberate upon, nor any end to prosecute. In a word, it would put an end to his activity, reduce him to be merely a passive being. Providence therefore has wisely drawn a veil over future events, affording us no light for prying into them but sagacity and experience.

These are a few of the numberless absurd opinions about the conduct of Providence, that have prevailed among Christians, and still prevail among some of them. Many opinions no less absurd have prevailed about speculative points. I confine myself to one or two instances; for to make a complete list would require a volume. The first I shall mention, and the most noted, is transubstantiation; which, tho' it has not the least influence on practice, is reckoned so essential to salvation, as to be placed above every moral duty. The following text is appealed to as the sole foundation of that article of faith. "And as they were eating, Jesus
"took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the
"cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye
"all of it: for this is my blood of the new testament, which is
"shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you,
"I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that
"day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

“dom (a).” That this is a metaphor, must strike every one: the passage cannot even bear a literal meaning, considering the final clause; for surely the most zealous Roman believes not, that Christians are to drink new wine with their Saviour in the kingdom of heaven. At the same time, it is not so much as insinuated, that there was here any miraculous transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of our Saviour; nor is it insinuated, that the apostles believed they were eating the flesh of their master, and drinking his blood. St John, the favourite apostle, mentions not a word of this ceremony, which he certainly would not have omitted, had he imagined it an essential article of faith.

But supposing transubstantiation to be more clearly expressed in this text, than it really is; yet men of good understanding will be loth to admit a meaning that contradicts their five senses. They will reflect, that no man now living ever saw the original books of the New Testament; nor are they certain, that the editions we have, are copied directly from the originals. Every remove from them is liable to errors, which may justly create a suspicion of every text that contradicts reason and common sense. Add, that the bulk of Christians have not even a copy from the original to build their faith upon, but only a translation into another language.

And this leads to what chiefly determined me to select that instance. God and nature have bestowed upon us the faculty of reason, for distinguishing truth from falsehood. If by reasoning with candor and impartiality, we discover a proposition to be true or false, it is not in our power to remain indifferent: we must judge, and according to our judgement we must pronounce. I say more; to pronounce is a duty we owe to our Maker; for to

(a) St Matthew, xxvi. 26. &c.

what

what purpose has he bestow'd reason upon us, but in order to direct our belief? At the same time, we may depend on it as an intuitive truth, that God will never impose any belief on us, contradictory not only to our reason, but to our senses.

The following objection however will perhaps relish more with people of plain understanding. Transubstantiation is a very extraordinary miracle, reiterated every day and in every corner of the earth, by priests not always remarkable either for piety or for morality. Now I demand an answer to the following plain question: To what good end or purpose is such a profusion of miracles subservient? I see none. But I discover a very bad one, if they have any influence; which is, that they accustom the Roman Catholics to more cruelty and barbarity, than even the grossest savages are ever guilty of: some of them indeed devour the flesh of their enemies; but none of them, the flesh of their friends, especially of their greatest friend. But to do justice to people of that religion, I am confident, that this supposed miracle has no influence whatever upon their manners: to me it appears impossible for any man seriously to believe, that the bread and wine used at the Lord's supper, is actually converted into the body and blood of our Saviour. The Romish church requires the belief of transubstantiation; and a zealous Catholic, out of pure obedience, thinks he believes it. Convince once a man that salvation depends on belief, and he will believe any thing; that is, he will imagine that he believes: *Credo quia impossibile est* *.

That

* A traveller describing the Virgin Mary's house at Loretto, has the following reflection. "When there are so many saints endued with such miraculous powers, so many relics, and so many impregnated wells, each of them able to cure the most dangerous diseases; one would wonder, that physicians could live there, or others die. But people die here as elsewhere; and even churchmen, who preach upon the miracles wrought by relics, grow sick and die like other men." It is

“ nister, or in the action. First, in the matter. If the bread be
“ not of wheat, or if there be so great a mixture of other grain
“ that it cannot be called wheat-bread, or if any way corrupted;
“ it does not make a sacrament. If it be made with rose-water,
“ or any other distilled water, it is doubtful whether it make a
“ sacrament or not. Tho’ corruption have begun, or tho’ it be
“ leavened, it makes a sacrament, but the celebrator sins grievous-
“ ly.

“ If the celebrator, before consecration, observe that the host
“ is corrupted, or is not of wheat, he must take another host :
“ if after consecration, he must still take another and swallow it,
“ after which he must also swallow the first, or give it to another,
“ or preserve it in some place with reverence. But if he have
“ swallowed the first before observing its defects, he must never-
“ theless swallow also the perfect host ; because the precept about
“ the perfection of the sacrament, is of greater weight than that
“ of taking it fasting. If the consecrated host disappear by an
“ accident, as by wind, by a miracle, or by some animal, ano-
“ ther must be consecrated.

“ If the wine be quite sour or putrid, or made of unripe grapes,
“ or be mixed with so much water as to spoil the wine, it is no
“ sacrament. If the wine have begun to sour or to be corrupted,
“ or be quite new, or not mixed with water, or mixed with rose-
“ water or other distilled water, it makes a sacrament, but the ce-
“ lebrator sins grievously.

“ If the priest, before consecration, observe that the materials
“ are not proper, he must stop, if proper materials cannot be got ;
“ but after consecration, he must proceed, to avoid giving scan-
“ dal. If proper materials can be procured by waiting, he must
“ wait for them, that the sacrifice may not remain imperfect.

“ Second, in form. If any of the words of consecration be o-
“ mitted, or any of them be changed into words of a different
“ meaning,

“ meaning, it is no sacrament: if they be changed into words of
“ the same meaning, it makes a sacrament; but the celebrator
“ sins grievously.

“ Third, in the minister. If he does not intend to make a sa-
“ crament, but to cheat; if there be any part of the wine, or a-
“ ny wafer that he has not in his eye, and does not intend to
“ consecrate; if he have before him eleven wafers, and intends
“ to consecrate only ten, not determining what ten he intends:
“ in these cases the consecration does not hold, because intention
“ is requisite. If he think there are ten only, and intends to
“ consecrate all before him, they are all consecrated; therefore
“ priests ought always to have such intention. If the priest,
“ thinking he has but one wafer, shall, after the consecration,
“ find two sticking together, he must take them both. And he
“ must take off all the remains of the consecrated matter; for
“ they all belong to the same sacrifice. If in consecrating, the
“ intention be not actual by wandering of mind, but virtual in
“ approaching the altar, it makes a sacrament: tho’ priests
“ should be careful to have intention both virtual and actual.

“ Beside intention, the priest may be deficient in disposition of
“ mind. If he be suspended, or degraded, or excommunicated,
“ or under mortal sin, he makes a sacrament, but sins grievous-
“ ly. He may be deficient also in disposition of body. If he
“ have not fasted from midnight, if he have tasted water, or any
“ other drink or meat, even in the way of medicine, he cannot
“ celebrate nor communicate. If he have taken meat or drink
“ before midnight, even tho’ he have not slept nor digested it,
“ he does not sin. But on account of the perturbation of mind,
“ which bars devotion, it is prudent to refrain.

“ If any remains of meat, sticking in the mouth, be swallow-
“ ed with the host, they do not prevent communicating, provi-
“ ded they be swallowed, not as meat, but as spittle. The same
“ is

“ is to be said, if in washing the mouth a drop of water be swallowed, provided it be against our will.

“ Fourth, in the action. If any requisite be wanting, it is no sacrament; for example, if it be celebrated out of holy ground, or upon an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three napkins; if there be no wax candles; if it be not celebrated between day-break and noon; if the celebrator have not said matins with lauds; if he omit any of the sacerdotal robes; if these robes and the napkins be not blessed by a bishop; if there be no clerk present to serve, or one who ought not to serve, a woman, for example; if there be no chalice, the cup of which is gold, or silver, or pewter; if the vestment be not of clean linen adorned with silk in the middle, and blessed by a bishop; if the priest celebrate with his head covered; if there be no missal present, tho’ he have it by heart.

“ If a gnat or spider fall into the cup after consecration, the priest must swallow it with the blood, if he can: otherwise, let him take it out, wash it with wine, burn it, and throw it with the washings into holy ground. If poison fall into the cup, the blood must be poured on tow or on a linen cloth, remain till it be dry, then be burnt, and the ashes be thrown upon holy ground. If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted.

“ If the blood freeze in winter, put warm cloths about the cup: if that be not sufficient, put the cup in boiling water.

“ If any of Christ’s blood fall on the ground by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, and the place scraped: the scrapings must be burnt, and the ashes buried in holy ground.

“ If the priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, it must be licked up most reverently. If a nausea prevent that to be done, it must be kept till it be corrupted. If the spe-

“ cies

"cies do not appear, let the vomit be burnt, and the ashes thrown
"upon holy ground."

As the foregoing article has beyond intention swelled to an enormous size, I shall add but one other article, which, at the same time, shall be extremely short; and that is the creed of Athanasius. It is a heap of unintelligible jargon; and yet we are appointed to believe every article of it, under the pain of eternal damnation. As it enjoins belief of rank contradictions, it seems purposely calculated to be a test of slavish submission to the tyrannical authority of a proud and arrogant priest*.

C H A P. III.

RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

IN the foregoing chapter are traced the gradual advances of the sense of Deity, from its imperfect state among savages to its maturity among enlightened nations, displaying to us one great being to whom all other beings owe their existence, who made the world, and who governs it by the most perfect laws. And our perception of Deity, arising from that sense, is fortified by an intuitive proposition, that there necessarily must exist some being who had no beginning. Considering the Deity as the author of our existence, we owe him gratitude; considering him as govern-

* Bishop Burnet seems doubtful whether this creed was composed by Athanasius; tho' his doubts, in my apprehension, are scarce sufficient to weigh against the unanimous opinion of the Christian church.

or of the world, we owe him obedience: and upon these duties is founded the obligation we are under to worship him. Further, God made man for society, and implanted in his nature the moral sense to direct his conduct in that state. From these premises, may it not with certainty be inferred to be the will of God, that men should obey the dictates of the moral sense in fulfilling every duty of justice and benevolence? These moral duties, it would appear, are our chief business in this life; being enforced not only by a moral but by a religious principle.

Morality, as laid down in a former sketch, consists of two great branches, viz. the moral sense, which unfolds our duty to man, and an active moral principle, which prompts us to perform that duty. Natural religion consists also of two great branches, viz. the sense of Deity, which unfolds our duty to our Maker, and the active principle of devotion, which prompts us to perform our duty to him. The universality of the sense of Deity proves it to be innate: the same reason proves the principle of devotion to be innate; for all men agree in worshipping superior beings, whatever difference there may be in the mode of worship.

Both branches of the duty we owe to God, that of worshipping him, and that of obeying his will with respect to our fellow-creatures, are summed up by the Prophet Micah in the following emphatic words. "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" The two articles first mentioned, are moral duties regarding our fellow-creatures; and as to such, what is required of us by the Lord is to do our duty to others, not only as directed by the moral sense, but as being the will of our Maker, to whom we owe absolute obedience. That branch of our duty is reserved for a second section: at present we are to treat of religious worship, included in the third article, viz. the walking humbly with our God.

S E C T. I.

Religious Worship.

THE obligation we are under to worship God, or to walk humbly with him, is, as observed above, founded on the two great principles of gratitude and obedience; both of them requiring fundamentally a pure heart, and a well-disposed mind. But heart-worship is alone not sufficient: there are over and above required external signs, testifying to others the sense we have of these duties, and a firm resolution to perform them. That such is the will of God, will appear as follows. The principle of devotion, like most of our other principles, partakes of the imperfection of our nature: yet however faint originally, it is capable of being greatly invigorated by cultivation and exercise. Private exercise is not sufficient. Nature, and consequently the God of nature, require public exercise or public worship: for devotion is infectious, like joy or grief (*a*); and by mutual communication in a numerous assembly, is greatly invigorated. A regular habit of expressing publicly our gratitude and resignation, never fails to purify the mind, tending to wean it from every unlawful pursuit. This is the true motive of public worship; not what is commonly inculcated, viz. That it is required from us, as a testimony to our Maker of our obedience to his laws: God, who knows the heart, needs no such testimony *. I shall only add upon the general head,

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 1. p. 180. edit. 5.

* Arnobius (*Adversus gentes*, lib. 1.) accounts rationally for the worship we pay to the Deity: "Huic omnes ex more prosternimur, hunc collatis precibus adoramus,"

head, that lawgivers ought to avoid with caution the enforcing public worship by rewards and punishments: human laws cannot reach the heart, in which the essence of worship consists: they may indeed bring on a listless habit of worship, by separating the external act from the internal affection, than which there can be nothing more hurtful to true religion. The utmost that can be safely ventured, is to bring public worship under censorian powers, as a matter of police, for preserving good order, and for preventing bad example.

The religion of Confucius, professed by the *literati* and persons of rank in China and Tonquin, consists in a deep inward veneration for the God or King of heaven, and in the practice of every moral virtue. They have neither temples, nor priests, nor any settled form of external worship: every one adores the supreme Being in the manner he himself thinks best. This is indeed the most refined system of religion that ever took place among men. There is however an invincible objection against it, which is, that it is not fitted for the human race: an excellent religion it would

“mus, ab hoc iusta, et honesta, et auditu ejus condigna, deprecemur. Non quo
“ipse desideret supplices nos esse, aut amet subterni tot millium venerationem vide-
“re. Utilitas hæc nostra est, et commodi nostri rationem spectans. Nam quia
“præni ad culpas, et ad libidinis varios appetitus, vitio sumus infirmitatis ingenitæ,
“patitur se semper nostris cogitationibus concipi: ut dum illum oramus, et mere-
“ri ejus contendimus munera, accipiamus innocentie voluntatem, et ab omni nos
“labe delictorum omnium amputatione purgemus.”— [*In English thus: “It is
“our custom to prostrate ourselves before him; and we ask of him such gifts only
“as are consistent with justice and with honour, and suitable to the character of the
“Being whom we adore. Not that he receives pleasure or satisfaction from the
“humble veneration of thousands of his creatures. From this we ourselves derive
“benefit and advantage; for being the slaves of appetite, and prone to err from
“the weakness of our nature, when we address ourselves to God in prayer, and
“study by our actions to merit his approbation, we gain at least the wish, and the
“inclination, to be virtuous.”]*

be for angels ; but is far too refined, even for sages and philosophers.

Proceeding to deviations from the genuine worship required by our Maker, and gross deviations there have been, I begin with that sort of worship which is influenced by fear, and which for that reason is universal among savages. The American savages believe, that there are inferior deities without end, most of them prone to mischief : they neglect the supreme Deity because he is good ; and direct their worship to soothe the malevolent inferior deities from doing harm. The inhabitants of the Molucca islands, who believe the existence of malevolent invisible beings subordinate to the supreme benevolent Being, confine their worship to the former, in order to avert their wrath ; and one branch of their worship is, to set meat before them, hoping that when the belly is full, there will be less inclination to mischief. The worship of the inhabitants of Java is much the same. The negroes of Benin worship the devil, as Dapper expresses it, and sacrifice to him both men and beasts. They acknowledge indeed a supreme Being, who created the universe, and governs it by his Providence : but they regard him not ; “ for,” say they, “ it is needless, if not impertinent, to invoke a being, who, good and gracious, is incapable of injuring or molesting us.”

The austerities and penances that are practised in almost all religions, spring from the same root. One way to please invisible malignant powers, is to make ourselves as miserable as possible. Hence the horrid penances of the Faquirs in Hindostan, who outdo in mortification whatever is reported of the ancient Christian anchorites. Some of these Faquirs continue for life in one posture : some never lie down : some have always their arms raised above their head : and some mangle their bodies with knives and scourges. The town of Jagrenate in Hindostan is frequented by pilgrims, some of them from the distance of 300 leagues, which they

they travel, not by walking or riding, but by measuring the road with the length of their bodies; in which method of loco-motion, some of them consume years, before they complete their pilgrimage. A religious sect made its way some centuries ago into Japan, termed *Buddoists*, from *Budd*, the founder. This sect has prevailed over the ancient sect of the *Sintos*, chiefly by its austerity and mortifications. The spirit of this sect inspires nothing but excessive fear of the gods, who are painted prone to vengeance, and always offended. The people of that religion pass most of their time in tormenting themselves, to expiate imaginary faults; and they are treated by their priests with despotism and cruelty, that is not paralleled but by the inquisitors of Spain. The manners of the people are fierce, cruel, and unrelenting, such as never fail to be inspired by horrible superstition. The notion of invisible malevolent powers, formerly universal, is not to this hour eradicated, even among Christians; for which I appeal to the fastings and flagellations among Roman-Catholics, held by them to be an essential part of religion. People infected with religious horrors, are never seriously convinced, that an upright heart and sound morality make the essence of religion. The doctrine of the *Janfenists*, concerning repentance and mortification, shows evidently, however they may deceive themselves, that they have an impression of the Deity as a malevolent being. They hold the guilt contracted by Adam's fall to be a heinous sin, which ought to be expiated by acts of mortification, such as the torturing and macerating the body with painful labour, excessive abstinence, continual prayer and contemplation. Their penances, whether for original or voluntary sin, are carried to extravagance; and they who put an end to their lives by such severities, are termed the sacred victims of repentance, consumed by the fire of divine love. Such suicides are esteemed peculiarly meritorious in the eye of Heaven; and it is thought, that their sufferings cannot fail to appease the
anger

anger of the Deity. That celibacy is a state of purity and perfection, is a prevailing notion in many countries: among the Pagans, a married man was forbid to approach the altar, for some days after knowing his wife; and this ridiculous notion of pollution, contributed to introduce celibacy among the Roman-Catholic priests. The Emperor Otho, *anno* 1218, became a signal penitent: but instead of atoning for his sins by repentance and restitution, he laid himself down to be trod under foot by the boys of his kitchen; and frequently submitted to the discipline of the whip, inflicted by monks. The Emperor Charles V. toward the end of his days, was sorely depressed in spirit with fear of hell. Monks were his only companions, with whom he spent his time in chanting hymns. As an expiation for his sins, he in private disciplined himself with such severity, that his whip, found after his death, was tinged with his blood. Nor was he satisfied with these acts of mortification: timorous and illiberal solicitude still haunting him, he aimed at something extraordinary, at some new and singular act of piety, to display his zeal, and to merit the favour of Heaven. The act he fixed on was as wild as any that superstition ever suggested to a distempered brain: it was to celebrate his own obsequies. He ordered his tomb to be erected in the chapel of the monastery: his domestics marched there in funeral procession, holding black tapers: he followed in his shroud: he was laid in his coffin with much solemnity: the service of the dead was chanted; and he himself joined in the prayers offered up for his *requiem*, mingling his tears with those of his attendants. The ceremony closed with sprinkling holy water upon the coffin; and the assistants retiring, the doors of the chapel were shut. Then Charles rose out of the coffin, and stole privately to his apartment.

The history of ancient sacrifices is not so accurate, as in every instance to ascertain upon what principle they were founded, whether

ther upon fear, upon gratitude for favours received, or to solicit future favour. Human sacrifices undoubtedly belong to the present head: for being calculated to deprecate the wrath of a malevolent deity, they could have no other motive but fear; and indeed they are a most direful effect of that passion. It is needless to lose time in mentioning instances, which are well known to those who are acquainted with ancient history. A number of them are collected in Historical Law-tracts (a): and to these I take the liberty of adding, that the Cimbrians, the Germans, the Gauls, particularly the Druids, practised human sacrifices; for which we have the authority of Julius Cæsar, Strabo, and other authors. A people upon the Mississippi, named *Tensas*, worship the sun, and, like the Natches their neighbours, have a temple for that luminary, with a sacred fire in it, continually burning. The temple having been set on fire by thunder, was all in flames, when some French travellers saw them throw children into the fire, one after another, to appease the incensed deity. The Prophet Micah (b), in a passage partly quoted above, inveighs bitterly against such sacrifices: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

The ancient Persians acknowledged Oromazes and Arimanes as their great deities, authors of good and ill to men. But I find

(a) Tract 1.

(b) Chap. 6.

not that Arimanes, the evil principle, was ever an object of any religious worship. The Gaures, who profess the ancient religion of Persia, address no worship but to one God, all-good and all-powerful.

Next, of worshipping the Deity in the character of a mercenary being. Under that head come sacrifices and oblations, whether prompted by gratitude for favours received, or by self-interest to procure future favours; which, for the reason mentioned, I shall not attempt to distinguish. As the deities of early times were thought to resemble men, it is not wonderful, that men endeavoured to conciliate their favour, with such offerings as were the most acceptable to themselves. It is probable, that the first sacrifices of that kind were of sweet-smelling herbs, which in the fire emitted a flavour, that might reach the nostrils of a deity, even at a distance. The burning incense to their gods, was practised in Mexico and Peru; and at present is practised in the peninsula of Corea. An opportunity so favourable for making religious zeal a fund of riches to the priesthood, is seldom neglected. There was no difficulty to persuade ignorant people, that the gods could eat as well as smell: what was offered to a deity for food, being carried into the temple, was understood to be devoured by him.

With respect to the Jewish sacrifices of burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, sin-offerings, peace-offerings, heave-offerings, and wave-offerings, these were appointed by God himself, in order to keep that stiff-necked people in daily remembrance of their dependence on him, and to preserve them if possible from idolatry. But that untractable race did not adhere to the purity of the institution: they insensibly degenerated into the notion that their God was a mercenary being; and in that character only, was the worship of sacrifices performed to him: the offerings mentioned were liberally bestowed on him, not singly as a token of their dependence,

pendence, but chiefly in order to avert his wrath, or to gain his favour *.

The religious notions of the Greeks were equally impure: they could not think of any means for conciliating the favour of their gods, more efficacious than gifts. Homer paints his gods as mercenary to an extreme. In the fourth book of the Iliad, Jupiter says, "Of these cities, honoured the most by the soul of Jove, is sacred Troy. Never stands the altar empty before me, oblations poured forth in my presence, favour that ascends the skies." Speaking in the fifth book of a warrior, known afterward to be Diomedes, "Some god he is, some power against the Trojans enraged for vows unpaid: destructive is the wrath of the gods." Diomedes prays to Minerva, "With thine arm ward from me the foe: a year-old heifer, O Queen, shall be thine, broad-fronted, unbroken, and wild: her to thee I will offer with prayer, gilding with gold her horns." Precisely of the same kind, are the offerings made by superstitious Roman-Catholics to the Virgin Mary, and to saints. Electra, in the tragedy of that name, supplicates Apollo in the following terms.

O! hear Electra too;
Who, with unsparing hand, her choicest gifts
Hath never fail'd to lay before thy altars;
Accept the little All that now remains
For me to give.

The people of Hindostan, as mentioned above, atone for their

* There is no mention in ancient authors of fish being offered to the gods in sacrifice: The reason I take to be, that the most savoury food of man was reckoned the most agreeable to their gods; that savages never thought of fish till land-animals became scarce; and that the matter as well as form of sacrifices were established in practice, long before men had recourse to fish for food.

sin by austere penances ; but they have no notion of presenting gifts to the Deity, nor of deprecating his wrath with the blood of animals. On the contrary, they reckon it a sin to slay any living creature ; which reduces them to vegetable food. This is going too far ; for the Deity could never mean to prohibit animal food, when man's chief dependence originally was upon it. The abstaining, however, from animal food, shows greater humanity in the religion of Hindostan, than of any other known country. The inhabitants of Madagascar are in a stage of religion, common among many nations, which is, the acknowledging one supreme benevolent deity, and many malevolent inferior deities. Most of their worship is indeed addressed to the latter ; but they have so far advanced before several other nations, as to offer sacrifices to the supreme Being, without employing either idols or temples.

Philosophy and sound sense, in polished nations, have purified religious worship, by banishing the profession at least of oblations and sacrifices. The Being that made the world, governs it by laws that are inflexible, because they are the best possible ; and to imagine that he can be moved by prayers, oblations, or sacrifices, to vary his plan of government, is an impious thought, degrading the Deity to a level with ourselves : “ Hear, O my people, and I “ will testify against thee : I am God, even thy God. I will take “ no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goat out of thy fold : for “ every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand “ hills. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats ? “ Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows to the Most “ High. Call upon me in the day of trouble : I will deliver thee, “ and thou shalt glorify me (a).” “ Thou desirest not sacrifice, “ else would I give it ; thou delightest not in burnt-offering.

(a) Psalm 50.

"The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise (a)." "For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God, more than burnt-offerings (b)." In dark ages, there is great shew of religion, with little heart-worship: in ages of philosophy, warm heart-worship, with little shew *.

This is a proper place for the history of idolatry; which, as will anon appear, sprung from religious worship, corrupted by

* Agathias urges a different reason against sacrifices. "Ego nullam naturam esse existimo, cui voluptati sint fœdata sanguine altaria, et animantium laniens. Quod si qua tamen est cui ista sint cordi, non ea mitis et benigna est aliqua, sed fera ac rabida, qualem pavorem poetæ fingunt, et Metum, et Bellonam, et Malam Fortunam, et Discordiam, quam indomitam appellant." — [*In English thus*: "I cannot conceive, that there should exist a superior being, who takes delight in the sacrifice of animals, or in altars stained with blood. If such there be, his nature is not benevolent, but barbarous and cruel. Such indeed were the gods whom the poets have created: such were Fear and Terror, the goddesses of War, of Evil Fortune, and of Discord."] — Arnobius batters down bloody sacrifices with a very curious argument. "Ecce si bos aliquis, aut quodlibet ex his animal, quod ad placandas cœditur mitigandasque ad numinum furias, vocem hominis sumat, eloquaturque his verbis: Ergone, O Jupiter, aut quis alius deus es, humanum est istud et rectum, aut æquitatis alicujus in æstimatione ponendum, ut cum alius peccaverit, ego occidar, et de meo sanguine fieri tibi patiaris satis, qui nunquam te læserim, nunquam sciens aut nesciens, tuum numen majestatemque violarim, animal, ut scis, mutum, naturæ meæ simplicitatem sequens, nec multiformium morum varietatibus lubricum?" — [*In English thus*: "What if the ox, while he is led out to slaughter to appease the fancied wrath of an offended deity, should assume the human voice, and in these words astonish his conductors: Are these, O merciful God, are these the dictates of humanity, or of justice, that for the crime of another I should forfeit my life. I have never by my will offended thee, and, dumb as I am, and uninformed by reason, my actions, according to the simplicity of my nature, cannot have given thee displeasure, who hast made me as I am."] — If this argument were solid, it would be equally conclusive against animal food.

(a) Psalm 51.

(b) Hosea vi. 6.

men of shallow understanding and gross conceptions, upon whom things invisible make little impression.

Savages, even of the lowest class, have an impression of invisible powers, tho' they cannot form any distinct notion of them. But such impression is too faint for the exercise of devotion. Whether inspired with love to a good being, or with fear of an ill being, savages are not at ease without some sort of visible object to animate them. A great stone served that purpose originally; a very low instrument indeed of religious worship; but not altogether whimsical, if it was introduced, which is highly probable, in the following manner. It was an early and a natural custom among savages, to mark with a great stone, the place where their worthies were interred; of which we have hints every where in ancient history, particularly in the poems of Ossian. "Place me," says Calmar, mortally wounded, "at the side of a stone of remembrance, that future times may hear my fame, and the mother of Calmar rejoice over the stone of my renown." Superstition in later times having deified these worthies, their votaries, rejoicing as formerly over the stones dedicated to them, held these stones to be essential in every act of religious worship performed to their new deities*.

* Frequent mention is made of such stones in the poems of Ossian. "But remember, my son, to place this sword, this bow, and this horn, within that dark and narrow house marked with one gray stone." p. 55. "Whose fame is in that dark-green tomb? Four stones with their heads of moss stand there, and mark the narrow house of death." p. 67. "Let thy bards mourn those who fell. Let Erin give the sons of Lochlin to earth, and raise the mossy stones of their fame; that the children of the north hereafter may behold the place where their fathers fought." p. 78. "Earth here incloses the loveliest pair on the hill: grass grows between the stones of the tomb." p. 208. In the same poems we find stones made instruments of worship. The spirit of Loda is introduced threatening Fingal: "Fly to thy land, replied the form: receive the wind and fly. The blasts are in the hollow of my hand: the course of the storm is mine. The King of Sora is my son: he bends at the stone of my power." p. 200.

Tradition

Tradition points out many stones in different parts of the world, that were used in religious worship. A large stone worshipped by the Pessenuntians, a people of Phrygia, under the name of *Idea mater*, was, upon a solemn embassy to that people, brought to Rome; it being contained in the Sybilline books, that unless the Romans got possession of that goddess, they never would prevail over Hannibal. And Pausanias mentions many stones in Greece, dedicated to different divinities; particularly thirty square stones in Achaia, on which were engraved the names of as many gods. In another place, he mentions a very ancient statue of Venus in the island Delos, which, instead of feet, had only a square stone. This may appear a puzzling circumstance in the history of Greece, considering that all the Grecian gods were originally mortals, whom it was easy to represent by statues: but in that early period, the Greeks knew no more of statuary than the most barbarous nations. It is perhaps not easy to gather the meaning of savages, with respect to such stones: the most natural conjecture is, that a great stone, dedicated to the worship of a certain deity, was considered as belonging to him. This notion of property had a double effect: the worshippers, by connection of ideas, were led from the stone to the deity: and the stone tended to fix their wandering thoughts. It was probably imagined, over and above, that some latent virtue communicated to the stone, made it holy or sacred. Even among enlightened people, a sort of virtue or sanctity is conceived to reside in the place of worship: why not also in a stone dedicated to a deity? The ancient Ethiopians, in their worship, introduced the figure of a serpent as a symbol of the deity: two sticks laid cross represented Castor and Pollux, Roman divinities: a javelin represented their god Mars; and in Tartary, formerly, the god of war was worshipped under the symbol of an old rusty sabre. The ancient Persians used consecrated fire, as an emblem of the great God. Tho' the negroes of Congo
and

and Angola have images without number, they are not however idolaters in any proper sense: their belief is, that these images are only organs by which the deities signify their will to their votaries.

If the use that was made of stones and of other symbols in religious worship, be fairly represented, it may appear strange, that the ingenious Greeks sunk down into idolatry, at the very time they were making a rapid progress in the fine arts. Their improvements in statuary, one of these arts, was the cause. They began with attempting to carve heads of men and women, representing their deified heroes; which were placed upon the stones dedicated to these divinities. In the progress of the art, statues were executed complete in every member; and at last, statues of the gods were made, expressing such dignity and majesty, as insensibly to draw from beholders a degree of devotion to the statues themselves. Hear Quintilian upon that subject. "At quæ Polycleto defuerunt, Phidiæ atque Alcameni dantur. Phidias tamēn diis quam hominibus efficiendis melior artifex traditur: in ebore vero, longe citra æmulum, vel si nihil nisi Minervam Athenis aut Olympium in Elide Jovem fecisset, cujus pulchritudo adjecisse aliquid etiam receptæ religioni videtur; adeo majestas operis deum æquavit*." Here is laid a foundation for idolatry: let us trace its progress. Such statues as are represented by Quintilian, serve greatly to enflame devotion; and during a warm fit of the religious passion, the representation is lost,

* "The deficiencies of Polycletus were made up in Phidias and Alcamenes. Phidias is reckoned to have had more skill in forming the statues of gods than of men. In works of ivory he was unrivalled, altho' there had been no other proofs of his excellence than the statue of Minerva at Athens, and the Jupiter Olympius in Elis. Its beauty seems to have added to the received religion; the majestic statue resembling so much the god himself."

and

and the statue becomes a deity ; precisely as where King Lear is represented by Garrick : the actor vanishes ; and, behold ! the King himself. This is not singular. Anger occasions a metamorphosis still more extraordinary : if I happen to strike my gouty toe against a stone, the violence of the pain converts the stone for a moment into a voluntary agent ; and I wreak my resentment on it, as if it really were so. It is true, the image is only conceived to be a deity during the fervour of devotion ; and when that subsides, the image falls back to its original representative state. But frequent instances of that kind, have at last the effect among illiterate people, to convert the image into a sort of permanent deity : what such people see, makes a deep impression ; what they see not, little or none at all. There is another thing that concurs with eye-sight, to promote this delusion : devotion, being a vigorous principle in the human breast, will exert itself upon the meanest object, when none more noble is in view.

The ancient Persians held the consecrated fire to be an emblem only of the great God : but such veneration was paid to that emblem, and with so great ceremony was it treated, that the vulgar came at last to worship it as a sort of deity. The priests of the Gaures watch the consecrated fire day and night : they keep it alive with the purest wood, without bark : they touch it not with sword nor knife : they blow it not with bellows, nor with the mouth : even the priest is prohibited to approach it, till his mouth be covered with fine linen, lest it be polluted with his breath : if it happen to go out, it must be rekindled by striking fire from flint, or by a burning glass.

The progress of idolatry will more clearly appear, from attending to the religion of the Greeks and Romans. The Greeks, as mentioned above, made use of stones in divine worship, long before idolatry was introduced : and we learn from Varro, that for a hundred and seventy years after Numa, the Romans had no statues

tues nor images in their temples. After statues of the gods came in fashion, they acquired by degrees more and more respect. The Greek and Roman writers, talk of divine virtue being communicated to statues ; and some of the Roman writers talk familiarly, of the *numen* of a deity residing in his statue. Arnobius, in his book against the Gentiles, introduces a Gentile delivering the following opinion. “ We do not believe, that the metal which composes a statue, whether gold, or silver, or brass, is a god. But “ we believe, that a solemn dedication brings down the god to “ inhabit his image ; and it is the god only that we worship in “ that image.” This explains the Roman ceremony, of inviting to their side the tutelar deities of towns besieged by them, termed *evocatio tutelarium deorum* : the Romans, cruel as they were, overflowed with superstition ; and as they were averse from combating the tutelar deities even of their enemies, they endeavoured to gain these deities by large promises, and assurance of honourable treatment. As they could not hope that a statue would change its place, their notion must have been, that by this ceremony, the tutelar deity might be prevailed upon to withdraw its *numen*, and leave the statue a dead lump of matter. When Stilpo was banished by the Areopagus of Athens for affirming, that the statue in the temple of Minerva was not the goddess, but a piece of matter carved by Phidias ; he surely was not condemned for saying, that the statue was made by Phidias, a fact universally known : his heresy consisted in denying that the *numen* of Minerva resided in the statue. Augustus, having twice lost his fleet by storm, forbade Neptune to be carried in procession along with the other gods ; imagining he had avenged himself of Neptune, by neglecting the favourite statue in which his *numen* resided.

When saints in the Christian church were deified, even their images became objects of worship ; from a fond imagination, that such worship draws down into the images, the souls of the saints they

they represent: which is the same doctrine that Arnobius, in the passage above mentioned, ascribes to the Gentiles; and is not widely different from the belief of the Pagan Tartars and Ostiaks, by and by to be mentioned. In the eleventh century, there was a violent dispute about images in the Greek church; many asserting, that in the images of our Saviour and of the saints, there resides an inherent sanctity, which is a proper object of worship; and that Christians ought not to confine their worship to the persons represented, but ought also to extend it to their images.

As ignorant and savage nations can form no conception of Deity, but of a being like a man, only superior in power and greatness, images are made of the Deity in several nations conformable to this conception. It is easy to make some resemblance of a man; but how is power and greatness to be represented? To perform this with propriety, would require a Hogarth. Savages go more bluntly to work: they endeavour to represent a man with many heads, and with a still greater number of hands. The northern Tartars seem to have no deities but certain statues or images coarsely formed out of wood, and bearing some distant resemblance to the human figure. To palliate so gross an absurdity, as that a god can be fabricated by the hands of man, they imagine this image to be endued with a soul: to say whence that soul came, would puzzle the wisest of them. That soul is conceived to be too elevated for dwelling constantly in a piece of matter: they believe that it resides in some more honourable place; and that it only visits the image or idol, when it is called down by prayers and supplications. They sacrifice to this idol, by rubbing its mouth with the fat of fish, and by offering it the warm blood of some beast killed in hunting. The last step of the ceremony is, to honour the soul of the idol with a joyful shout, as a sort of convoy to it when it returns home. The Ostiaks have a wooden idol, termed, *The Old Man of Oby*, who is guardian of
Vol. II. 3 G their

their fishery: it hath eyes of glass, and a head with short horns. When the ice dissolves, they crowd to this idol, requesting that he will be propitious to their fishery. If unsuccessful, he is loaded with reproaches: if successful, he is entitled to a share of the capture. They make a feast for him, rubbing his snout with choice fat; and, when the entertainment is over, they accompany the soul of the idol a little way, beating the air with their cudgels. The Ostiaks have another idol, that is fed with milk so abundantly, as to come out on both sides of the spoon, and to fall down upon the vesture; which, however, is never washed, so little is cleanliness thought essential to religion by that people. It is indeed wonderfully absurd, to think, that invisible souls require food like human creatures; and yet the same absurdity prevailed in Greece.

The ancient Germans, a sober and sensible people, had no notion of representing their gods by statues, nor of building temples to them. They worshipped in consecrated groves (*a*). The Egyptians, from a just conception that an invisible being can have no resemblance to one that is visible, employ'd hieroglyphical figures for denoting metaphorically the attributes of their gods; and they employ'd, not only the figures of birds and beasts, but of vegetables; leeks, for example, and onions. This metaphorical adjunct to religion, innocent in itself, sunk the Egyptians to the lowest degree of idolatry. As hieroglyphical figures, composed frequently of heterogeneous parts, resemble not any being human or divine; the vulgar, losing sight of the emblematic signification, which is not readily understood but by poets and philosophers, took up with the plain figures as real divinities. How otherwise can it be accounted for, that the ox, the ape, the onion, were in Egypt worshipped as deities? But this must be under-

(*a*) Tacitus de moribus Germanorum, cap. 9.

stood of the vulgar only. It is scarce supposable, that the better sort of people could think so grossly; and we have the authority of Plutarch for doubting. In his chapter upon Isis and Osiris, he observes, that the Egyptians worshipped the bull, the cat, and other animals; not as divinities, but as representatives of them, like an image seen in a glass; or, as he expresses it in another part of the same chapter, "just as we see the resemblance of the sun in a drop of water." However this be, the Egyptian worship is an illustrious instance of the influence of devotion: how powerful must it be in its purity, when even in a wrong direction, it can force its way against every obstacle of common sense! And such respect was paid to these animals, if we can trust Diodorus Siculus, that in a great famine, the Egyptians ventured not to touch the sacred animals, tho' they were forc'd to devour one another. The veneration paid to a cow in Hindostan arose probably from the same cause, viz. its having been used as a symbol of the Deity. A snake of a particular kind, about a yard long, and about the thickness of a man's arm, is worshipped by the Whidans in Guinea. It has a large round head, piercing eyes, a short pointed tongue, and a smooth skin, beautifully speckled. It has a strong antipathy to all the venomous kind; in other respects, innocent and tame. To kill them being a capital crime, they travel about unmolested, even into bedchambers. They occasioned, ann. 1697, a ridiculous persecution. A hog, teased by one of them, gnashed it with his tusks till it died. The priests carried their complaint to the king; and no one presuming to appear as counsel for the hogs, orders were issued for slaughtering the whole race. At once were brandished a thousand cutlasses; and the race would have been extirpated, had not the king interposed, representing to the priests, that they ought to rest satisfied with the innocent blood they had spilt. Rancour and cruelty never rage more violently, than under the mask of religion.

It is amazing how prone the most polished nations formerly were to idolatry. The Tyrians, besieged by Alexander, chained down Hercules, their tutelar deity, to prevent him from deserting to the enemy; which is said to have been also practised in Sparta. The city of Ambracia being taken by the Romans, and every statue of their gods being carried to Rome; the Ambracians complained bitterly, that not a single divinity was left them to worship. How much more rational are the Hindostan bramins, who teach their disciples, that idols are emblems only of the Deity, intended merely to fix the attention of the populace!

The first statues in Greece and Tuscany, were made with wings, to signify the swift motion of the gods. These statues were so clumsy, as scarce to resemble human creatures, not to talk of a divinity. But the admirable statues executed in later times, were imagined to resemble most accurately the deities represented by them: whence the vulgar notion, that gods have wings, and that angels have wings.

I proceed to what in the history of idolatry may be reckoned the second part. Statues, we have seen, were at first used as representatives only of the Deity; but came afterward to be metamorphosed into divinities. The absurdity did not stop there. People, not satisfied with the visible deities erected in temples for public worship, became fond to have private deities of their own, whom they worshipped as their tutelar deities; and this practice spread so wide, as that among many nations every family had household gods cut in wood or stone. Every family in Kamskatka has a tutelar deity in the shape of a pillar, with the head of a man, which is supposed to guard the house against malevolent spirits. They give it food daily, and anoint the head with the fat of fish. The Prophet Isaiah (a) puts this species of deification in a most ridi-

(a) Chap. 44.

culous light: "He burneth part thereof in the fire: with part thereof he roasteth flesh: of the residue he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down, worshipping, and praying to it, and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my god." Multiplication could not fail to sink household-gods into a degree of contempt: expectation of good from them, might produce some cold ceremonial worship; but there could be no real devotion at heart. The Chinese manner of treating their household-gods, will vouch for me. When a Chinese does not obtain what he prays for, "Thou spiritual dog," he will say, "I lodge thee well, thou art beautifully gilded, treated with perfumes and burnt-offerings; and yet thou with-holdest from me the necessaries of life." Sometimes they fasten a cord to the idol, and drag it through the dirt. The inhabitants of Ceylon treat their idols in the same manner. Thor, Woden, and Friga, were the great deities of the Scandinavians. They had at the same time inferior deities, who were supposed to have been men translated into heaven for their good works. These they treated with very little ceremony, refusing to worship them if they were not propitious; and even punishing them with banishment; but restoring them after a time, in hopes of amendment. Domestic idols are treated by the Ostiars not more reverently than by the people mentioned. But they have public idols, some particularly of brass, which are highly revered: the solidity of the metal is in their imagination connected with immortality; and great regard is paid to these idols, for the knowledge and experience they must have acquired in an endless course of time.

Saints, or tutelar deities, are sometimes not better treated among Roman Catholics, than among Pagans. "When we were in Portugal," says Captain Brydone, "the people of Castelbranco were so enraged at St Antonio, for suffering the Spaniards to plunder their town, contrary, as they affirmed, to his express agreement

“ment with them, that they broke many of his statues to pieces; and one that had been more revered than the rest, they took the head off, and in its stead placed one of St Francis. The great St Januarius himself was in imminent danger, during the last famine at Naples. They loaded him with abuse and invective; and declared point-blank, that if he did not procure them corn by such a time, he should be no longer their saint.” The tutelar saint of Cattania, at the foot of Mount Etna, is St Agatha. A torrent of lava burst over the walls, and laid waste great part of that beautiful city. Where was St Agatha at this time? The people say, that they had given her just provocation; but that she has long ago been reconciled to them, and has promised never to suffer the lava to hurt them again. At the foot of Mount Etna, a statue of a saint is placed as a memorial, for having prevented the lava from running up the mountain of Taurominum, and destroying that town; the saint having conducted the lava down a low valley to the sea.

When a traveller once happens to deviate from the right road, there is no end of wandering. Porphyrius reports, that in Anubis, an Egyptian city, a real man was worshipped as a god; which is also asserted by Minucius Fœlix, in his apology for the Christians. A thousand writers have said, that the Tartars believe their high-priest, termed *Dalai Lama*, to be immortal. But that is a mistake: his death is published through the whole country; and couriers, sent even to Peking, intimate it to the Emperor of China: his effigy, at the same time, is taken down from the portal of the great church, and that of his successor is put in its stead. The system of the metempsychosis, adopted in that country, has occasion'd the mistake. They believe, that the holy spirit, which animates a Dalai Lama, passes upon his death into the body of his successor. The spirit therefore is believed to be immortal, not the body. The Dalai Lama, however, is the object of profound veneration.

The

The Tartar princes are daily sending presents to him, and consulting him as an oracle: they even undertake a pilgrimage in order to worship him in person. In a retired part of the temple, he is shown covered with precious stones, and sitting cross-legged. They prostrate themselves before him at a distance, for they are not permitted to kiss his toe. The priests make traffic even of his excrements, which are greedily purchased at a high price, and are kept in a golden box hanging from the neck, as a charm against every misfortune. Like the cross of Jesus, or the Virgin's milk, we may believe, there never will be wanting plenty of that precious stuff to answer all demands: the priests out of charity will furnish a quota, rather than suffer votaries to depart with their money for want of goods to purchase. The person of the Japan Pope, or Ecclesiastical Emperor, is held so sacred, as to make the cutting his beard, or his nails, a deadly sin. But absurd laws are never steadily executed. The beard and the nails are cut in the night-time, when the Pope is supposed to be sleeping; and what is taken away by that operation, is understood to be stolen from him, which is no impeachment upon his Holiness.

That the Jews were idolaters when they sojourned in the land of Goshen, were it not presumable from their commerce with the Egyptians, would however be evident from the history of Moses. Notwithstanding their miraculous deliverance from the Egyptian king, notwithstanding the daily miracles wrought among them in the wilderness; so addicted were they to a visible deity, that, during even the momentary absence of Moses conversing with God on the mount, they fabricated a golden calf, and worshipped it as their god. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go, get thee down: for thy people which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves: they have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, have worshipped it, have sacrificed thereunto,

“thereunto, and said, These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt (a).” The history of the Jews, shows how difficult it is to reclaim from idolatry a brutish people, addicted to superstition, and fettered by inveterate habit. What profusion of blood, to bring that obstinate and perverse people to the true religion! all in vain. The book of Judges, in particular, is full of reiterated relapses, from their own invisible God, to the visible gods of other nations. And in all probability, their anxious desire for a visible king, related in the first book of Samuel, arose from their being deprived of a visible god. There was a necessity for prohibiting images (b); which would have soon been converted into deities visible: and it was extremely prudent, to supply the want of a visible god, with endless shews and ceremonies; which accordingly became the capital branch of the Jewish worship.

It appears to me from the whole history of the Jews, that a gross people are not susceptible but of a gross religion; and without an enlightened understanding, that it is vain to think of eradicating superstition and idolatry. And after all the covenants made with the Jews, after all the chastisements and all the miracles lavish'd on them, that they were not however reclaimed from the most groveling idolatry, is evident from the two golden calves fabricated by Jeroboam, saying, “Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt (c).” The people also of Judah fell back to idol-worship under Rehoboam, son of Solomon (d). Jehu, king of the ten tribes, did not tolerate the

(a) Exod. xxxii. 7.

(b) Deuteronomy, xvi. 22.

(c) 1 Kings, xii. 28.

(d) 1 Kings, xiv. 23.

worship of other gods (*a*) ; but he continued to worship the two golden calves fabricated by Jeroboam (*b*). Down to the days of King Hezekiah, the Jews worshipped the brazen serpent erected by Moses in the wilderness. The Jews seem indeed to have been a very perverse people : the many promises and threatenings announced by their prophets, and the many miracles wrought among them, had no permanent effect to restrain them from idolatry ; and yet, during their captivity in Babylon, several of them submitted to be burnt alive, rather than to join in idol-worship (*c*). Captivity cured them radically of idolatry ; and from that period to this day, they have not been guilty of a single relapse. Xiphilin, in his abridgement of Dion Cassius, relating their war with Pompey, many centuries after the Babylonish captivity, gives the following account of them. “ Their customs are quite “ different from those of other nations. Beside a peculiar manner of “ living, they acknowledge none of the common deities : they acknowledge but one, whom they worship with great veneration. “ There never was an image in Jerusalem ; because they believe “ their God to be invisible and ineffable. They have built him a “ temple of great size and beauty, remarkable in the following “ particular, that it is open above, without any roof.”

There lies no solid objection against images among an enlightened people, when used merely to rouse devotion. But as images tend to pervert the vulgar, they ought not to be admitted into churches : pictures are less liable to be misapprehended ; and the Ethiopians accordingly indulge pictures, tho’ they prohibit statues, in their churches. The general council of Frankfort permit-

(*a*) 2 Kings, x. 25.

(*b*) 2 Kings, x. 29.

(*c*) Daniel, chap. 3.

ted the use of images in churches ; but strictly prohibited any worship to be addressed to them. So prone however to idolatry are the low and illiterate, that the prohibition lost ground both in France and in Germany ; and idol-worship became again general.

It is extremely probable, that the sun and moon were early held to be deities, and that they were the first visible objects of worship. It must indeed be acknowledged, that of all the different kinds of idolatry, it is the most excusable. Upon the sun depends health, vigour, and cheerfulness : during his retirement, all is dark and disconsolate : when he performs his majestic round, to bless his subjects, and to bestow fecundity upon every animal and vegetable, can a mere savage withhold gratitude and veneration ! Hear an old Pagan bard upon that subject. “ O thou who rollest above, round as the shield of my fathers ! “ Whence are thy beams, O sun, thy everlasting light ? Thou comest forth in thy awful beauty, and the stars hide their face : “ thou movest alone, for who can be a companion of thy course ! “ The oaks of the mountain fall : the mountains decay with years : the ocean shrinks and grows again : the moon herself is lost in heaven : but thou art for ever the same, rejoicing in the brightness of thy course. When tempests darken the world, “ when thunder rolls, and lightning flies, thou lookest in thy beauty from the clouds, and laughest at the storm (a).” Worship to the sun as a real deity, was in former times universal ; and prevails in many countries even at present. The American savages worship the sun, as sovereign of the universe, known by the name of *Ariskoui* among the Hurons, and of *Agriskoué* among the Iroquois. They offer him tobacco, which they term *smoking the sun* : the chief man in the assembly lights the calumet, and offers

(a) Ossian.

it thrice to the rising sun; imploring his protection, and recommending the tribe to his care. The chief proceeds to smoke; and every one smokes in his turn. This ceremony is performed on important occasions only: less matters are reserved for their Manitou. The Mississippi people offer to the sun the first of what they take in hunting; which their commander artfully converts to his own use. The Apalachites, bordering on Florida, worship the sun; but sacrifice nothing to him that has life: they hold him to be the parent of life, and think that he can take no pleasure in the destruction of any living creature: their devotion is exerted in perfumes and songs. The Mexicans, while a free people, presented to the sun a share of their meat and drink. The inhabitants of Darien, believe in the sun as their god, and in the moon as his wife, paying equal adoration to each. The people of Borneo, worship the sun and moon as real divinities. The Samoides worship both, bowing to them morning and evening in the Persian manner.

But if the sun and moon were the first objects of idolatry, knowledge and reflection reformed many from the error of holding these luminaries to be deities. "That original intelligence," say the Magians, "who is the first principle of all things, discovers himself to the mind and understanding only: but he hath placed the sun as his image in the visible universe; and the beams of that bright luminary, are but a faint copy of the glory that shines in the higher heavens." The Persians, as Herodotus reports, had neither temples, nor altars, nor images: for, says that author, they do not think, like the Greeks, that there is any resemblance between gods and men. The Gaures, who to this day profess the ancient religion of Persia, celebrate divine worship before the sacred fire, and turn with peculiar veneration toward the rising sun, as the representative of God; but they adore neither the sun, nor the sacred fire. They are professed e-

nemies to every image of the Deity cut with hands : and hence the havock made by the ancient Persians, upon the statues and temples of the Grecian gods. Such sublimity of thought was above the reach of other uninspired nations, excepting only the Hindows and Chinese.

I close the history of idolatry with a brief recapitulation of the outlines. Admitting the sun and moon to have been the first objects of idolatry, yet as Polytheism was once universal, they make only two of the many gods that were every where worshipped. We have seen, that the sacred fire was employ'd in the worship of the sun, and that images were employ'd in the worship of other deities. Images were originally used for the sole purpose of animating devotion : such was their use in Persia and Hindostan ; and such was their use in every country among philosophers. The Emperor Julian, in an epistle to Theodore concerning the images of the gods, says, " We believe not that these images are gods : " we only use them in worshipping the gods." In the progress toward idolatry, the next step is, to imagine, that a deity loves his image, that he makes it his residence, or at least communicates some virtue to it. The last step is, to imagine the image itself to be a deity ; which gained ground imperceptibly as statuary advanced toward perfection. It would be incredible that men of sense should ever suffer themselves to be impressed with so wild a delusion, were it not the overbearing influence of religious superstition. *Credo quia impossibile est*, is applicable to idolatry as well as to transubstantiation. The worshipping the sun and moon as deities, is idolatry in the strictest sense. With respect to images, the first step of the progress is not idolatry : the next is mixed idolatry : and the last is rank idolatry.

So much upon idolatry. I proceed to what approaches the nearest to it, which is worship addressed to deified mortals. The ancient gods were exalted so little above men, that it was no hard
task

task for the imagination to place in heaven, men who had made a figure on earth. The Grecian heaven was entirely peopled with such men, as well as that of many other nations. Men are deified every day by the Romish church, under the denomination of saints: persons are frequently selected for that honour who scarce deserved a place on earth, and some who never had a place there. The Roman Catholics copy the Pagans, in worshipping these subordinate divinities by prayers and oblations: and they are well rewarded, by being taken under protection of these saints in quality of tutelar deities. One branch of the office bestow'd on these saints, is to explain the wants of their votaries to the King of heaven, and to supplicate for them. The mediatorial office prevails with respect to earthly potentates, as well as heavenly: being struck with awe and timidity in approaching those exalted above us, we naturally take hold of some intermediate person to solicit for us. In approaching the Almighty, the mind, sinking down into humility and profound veneration, stops short, relying upon some friend in heaven to intercede in its behalf. Temples among the Cochinchinese are constructed with a deep and dark niche, which is their *sanctum sanctorum*. They hold, that no representation, whether by painting or sculpture, can be made of God, who is invisible. The niche denotes his incomprehensibility; and the good men placed by them in heaven, are believed to be their intercessors at the throne of grace. The prayers of the Chinguliese are seldom directed to the supreme being, but to his vicegerents. Intercessors, at the same time, contribute to the ease of their votaries: a Roman Catholic need not assume a very high tone in addressing a tutelar saint chosen by himself.

False notions of Providence have prompted groveling mortals to put confidence in mediators and intercessors of a still lower class, viz. living mortals, who by idle austerities have acquired a reputation for holiness. Take the following instance, the strongest

est of the kind that can be figured. Louis XI. of France, sensible of the approach of death, sent for a hermit of Calabria, named *Francisco Martarillo*; and throwing himself at the hermit's feet in a flood of tears, entreated him to intercede with God, that his life might be prolonged; as if the voice of a Calabrian friar, says Voltaire, could alter the course of Providence, by preserving a weak and perverse soul in a worn-out body.

Having discussed the persons that are the objects of worship, the next step in order is, to take under view the forms and ceremonies employ'd in religious worship. Forms are necessary wherever a number of persons join in one operation: they are essential in an army, and little less essential at public worship. The use of ceremonies is to excite devotion: but to preserve a just medium, requires great delicacy of taste; for tho' ceremonies are necessary at public worship to prevent languor, yet superfluity of ceremonies quenches devotion, by occupying the mind too much upon externals. The Roman-Catholic worship is crowded with ceremonies: it resembles the Italian opera, which is all sound, and no sentiment. The Presbyterian form of worship is too naked: it is proper for philosophers more than for the populace. This is fundamentally the cause of the numerous secessions from the church of Scotland that have made a figure of late: people dislike the established forms, when they find less comfort in public worship than is expected; and without being sensible of the real cause, they chuse pastors for themselves, who supply the want of ceremonies by loud speaking, with much external fervor and devotion.

The frequent ablutions or washings among the Mahometans and others, as acts of devotion, show the influence that the slightest resemblances have on the ignorant. Because purification, in several languages, is a term applicable to the mind as well as to the body, shallow thinkers, misled by the double meaning, imagine that the mind, like the body, is purified by water.

The

The sect of Ali use the Alcoran translated into the Persian language, which is their native tongue. The sect of Omar esteem this to be a gross impiety; being persuaded, that the Alcoran was written in Arabic, by the Angel Gabriel, at the command of God himself. The Roman Catholics are not then the only people who profess to speak nonsense to God Almighty; or, which is the same, who profess to pray in an unknown tongue.

At meals, the ancients poured out some wine as a libation to the gods: Christians pronounce a short prayer, termed a *grace*.

The gross notion of Deity entertained by the ancients, is exemplified in their worshipping and sacrificing on high places; in order, as they thought, to be more within sight. Jupiter in Homer praises Hector for sacrificing to him frequently upon the top of Ida; and Strabo observes, that the Persians, who used neither images nor altars, sacrificed to the gods in high places. Balak carried Balaam the prophet to the top of Pisgah, and other mountains, to sacrifice there, and to curse Israel. The votaries of Baal always worshipped in high places. Even the sage Tacitus was infected with that absurdity. Speaking of certain high mountains where the gods were worshipped, he expresses himself thus: *Maxime celo appropinquare, precesque mortalium a Deo nusquam propius audiri* *.

Ceremonies that tend to unhinge morality, belong more properly to the following section, treating of the connection between religion and morality.

It is now full time to take under consideration an objection to the sense of Deity hinted above, arguing from the gross conceptions of deity among many nations, that this sense cannot be innate. The objection is not indeed stated in the following passage,

* "As approaching nearer to heaven, the prayers of mortals are there more distinctly heard."

borrowed

borrowed from a justly-celebrated author ; but as it may be implied, the passage shall be fairly transcribed. " The universal
 " propensity to believe invifible intelligent power, being a general attendant on human nature, if not an original inftinct, may
 " be confidered as a kind of ftamp which the Deity has fet upon
 " his work ; and nothing furely can more dignify mankind,
 " than to be the only earthly being who bears the ftamp or image
 " of the univerfal Creator. But confult this image as it commonly is in popular religions : how is the Deity diffigured ! what
 " caprice, abfurdity, and immorality, are attributed to him (a)!"

A fatisfactory answer to the objection implied in this paffage, will occur, upon recollecting the progrefs of men and nations from infancy to maturity. Our external fenfes, neceffary for felf-prefervation, foon arrive at perfection : the more refined fenfes of propriety, of right and wrong, of Deity, of being accountable creatures, and many others of the fame kind, are of flower growth : the fenfe of right and wrong in particular, and the fenfe of Deity, feldom reach perfection, but by good education and much ftudy. If fuch be the cafe among enlightened nations, what is to be expected from favages who are in the loweft ftage of underftanding ? To a favage of New Holland, whole fenfe of deity is extremely obfcure, one may talk without end of a being who created the world, and who governs it by wife laws ; but in vain ; for the favage will be never the wifer. The fame favage hath alfo a glimmering of the moral fenfe, as all men have ; and yet in vain will you difcourfe to him of approbation and difapprobation, of merit and demerit : of thefe terms he has no clear conception. Hence the endlefs aberrations of rude and barbarous nations, from pure religion as well as from pure morality. Of the latter there are many inftances collected in the preceding tract ; and of

(a) Natural Hiftory of Religion.

the former, instances still more plentiful in the present tract. The sense of deity in dark times has indeed been strangely distorted by certain biases and passions that enslave the rude and illiterate: but these yield gradually to the rational faculty as it ripens, and at last leave religion free to found philosophy. Then it is that men, listening to the innate sense of deity purified from every bias, acquire a clear conviction of one supreme Deity who made and governs the world.

The foregoing objection then, impartially considered, weighs not against the sense of deity more than against the moral sense. If it have weight, it resolves into a complaint against Providence for the weakness of the sense of deity in rude and illiterate nations. If such complaint be solidly founded, it pierces extremely deep: why have not all nations, even in their nascent state, the sense of deity, and the moral sense, in purity and perfection? why do they not possess all the arts of life without necessity of culture or experience? why are we born poor and helpless infants, instead of being produced complete in every member, internal and external, as Adam and Eve were? The plan of Providence is far above the reach of our weak criticisms. I shall only observe, that as, with respect to individuals, there is a progress from infancy to maturity; so there is a similar progress in every nation, from its savage state to its maturity in arts and sciences. A child that has just conceptions of the Deity and of his attributes, would be a great miracle; and would not such knowledge in a savage be equally so? Nor can I discover what benefit a child or a savage could reap from such knowledge; provided it remained a child or a savage in every other respect. The genuine fruits of religion, are gratitude to the Author of our being, veneration to him as the supreme being, absolute resignation to the established laws of his providence, and chearful performance of every duty: but a child has not the slightest idea of gratitude nor of veneration, and very

little of moral duties ; and a savage, with respect to these, is not much superior to a child. The formation and government of the world, as far as we know, are excellent : we have great reason to presume the same with respect to what we do not know ; and every good man will rest satisfied with the following reflection, That we would have been men from the hour of our birth, complete in every part, had it been conformable to the system of unerring Providence.

S E C T. II.

Morality considered as a branch of duty to our Maker.

HAVING travelled long on a rough road, not a little fatiguing, the agreeable part lies before us ; which is, to treat of morality as a branch of religion. It was that subject which induced me to undertake the history of natural religion ; a subject that will afford salutary instruction, and will inspire true piety, if instruction can produce that effect.

Bayle starts a question, Whether a people may not be happy in society, and be qualified for good government, upon principles of morality singly, without any sense of religion. The question is ingenious, and may give opportunity for subtle reasoning ; but it is useless, because the fact supposed cannot happen. The principles of morality and of religion are equally rooted in our nature : they are indeed weak in children and in savages ; but they grow up together, and advance toward maturity with equal steps.

Where-

Where-ever the moral sense is in perfection, a sense of religion cannot be wanting; and if a man who has no sense of religion, live decently in society, he is more indebted for his conduct to good temper than to sound morals.

We have the authority of the Prophet Micah, formerly quoted, for holding, that religion, or, in other words, our duty to God, consists in doing justice, in loving mercy, and in walking humbly with him. The last is the foundation of religious worship, discussed in the foregoing section: the two former belong to the present head. And if we have gratitude to our Maker and Benefactor, if we owe implicit obedience to his will as our rightful sovereign, we ought not to separate the worship we owe to him, from justice and benevolence to our fellow-creatures; for to be unjust to them, to be cruel or hard-hearted, is a transgression of his will, no less gross than a total neglect of religious worship. "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets (a)." "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you. For I was hungry, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: sick, and ye visited me in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? When saw we thee

(a) Matthew, xxii. 36.

“ sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall
 “ answer, Verily I say unto you, in as much as ye have done it
 “ unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it un-
 “ to me (a).” “ Pure religion and undefiled before God, is this,
 “ To visit the fatherless and widow in their affliction; and to keep
 “ himself unspotted from the world (b).” “ *Hostias et victimas*
 “ *Domino offeram quas in usum mei protulit, ut rejiciam ei suum*
 “ *munus? Ingratum est; cum sit litabilis hostia bonus animus,*
 “ *et pura mens, et sincera conscientia. Igitur qui innocentiam co-*
 “ *lit, Domino supplicat; qui justitiam, Deo libat; qui fraudi-*
 “ *bus abstinet, propitiatur Deum; qui hominem periculo subripit,*
 “ *optimam victimam cedit. Hæc nostra sacrificia, hæc Dei sacra*
 “ *sunt. Sic apud nos religiosior est ille, qui justior * (c).*” The
 laws of Zaleucus, lawgiver to the Locrians, who lived before the
 days of Pythagoras, are introduced with the following preamble.
 “ No man can question the existence of Deity who observes the
 “ order and harmony of the universe, which cannot be the pro-
 “ duction of chance. Men ought to bridle their passions, and to
 “ guard against every vice. God is pleased with no sacrifice but
 “ a sincere heart; and differs widely from mortals, whose delight

* “ Shall I offer to God for a sacrifice those creatures which his bounty has
 “ given me for my use? It were ingratitude to throw back the gift upon the gi-
 “ ver. The most acceptable sacrifice is an upright mind, an untainted conscience,
 “ and an honest heart. The actions of the innocent ascend to God in prayer;
 “ the observance of justice is more grateful than incense; the man who is sincere
 “ in his dealings, secures the favour of his Creator; and the delivery of a fellow-
 “ creature from danger or destruction, is dearer in the eyes of the Almighty than
 “ the sacrifice of blood.”

(a) Matthew, xxv. 34.

(b) James, i. 27.

(c) Minucius Felix.

“are splendid ceremonies and rich offerings. Let justice therefore be studied; for by that only can a man be acceptable to the Deity. Let those who are tempted to do ill, have always before their eyes, the severe judgements of the gods against wicked men. Let them always keep in view the hour of death, that fatal hour which is attended with bitter remorse for transgressing the rules of justice. If a bad disposition incline you to vice, pray to Heaven at the foot of the altar, to mend your heart.”

Morality is thus included in religion. Some nations, however, leave not this proposition to reasoning or conviction, but ingross many moral duties in their religious creed. In the 67th chapter of the Sadder, a lie is declared to be a great sin, and is discharged even where it tends to bring about good. So much purer is the morality of the ancient Persians than of the present Jesuits. The religion of the people of Pegu, inculcates charity, forbids to kill, to steal, or to injure others. Attend to the consequence: that people, fierce originally, have become humane and compassionate. In a sacred book of the ancient Persians, it is written, “If you incline to be a saint, give good education to your children; for their virtuous actions will be imputed to you.” The people of Japan pay great respect to their parents; it being an article in their creed, That those who fail in duty to their parents, will be punished by the gods. In these two instances, religion tends greatly to connect parents and children in the most intimate tie of cordial affection. The reverence the Chinese have for their ancestors, and the ceremonies performed annually at their tombs, tend to keep them at home, and prevent their wandering into foreign countries.

Superstitious rites in some religions, are successfully employ'd to enforce certain moral duties. The Romans commonly made their solemn covenants in the capitol, before the statue of Jupiter;

ter; by which solemnity he was understood to guarantee the covenant, ready to pour out vengeance upon the transgressor. The Burates, a people in Grand Tartary, have a custom, which is, to demand an oath upon a mountain, held to be sacred. They are firmly persuaded, that the person who swears a falsehood, will not come down alive. The Essenes, a Jewish sect, bound themselves by a solemn oath, to shun unlawful gain, to be faithful to their promises, not to lie, and never to harm any one. In Cochinchina, the souls of those who have been eminent for arts or arms, are worshipped. Their statues are placed in the temples; and the size of a statue is proportioned to the merit of the person represented. If that custom be executed with candor, there cannot be a nobler incitement to public spirit. The Egyptians did not reach the thought of honouring virtue after death; but they dishonoured vice, by prohibiting it from the Elysian fields.

The salutary influence of religion on morality, is not confined to pure religion, whether by its connection with morality in general, or by inculcating particular moral duties. There are many religious doctrines, doubtful or perhaps erroneous, that contribute also to enforce morality. Some followers of Confucius ascribe immortality to the souls only of the just; and believe that the souls of the wicked perish with their bodies. In the second chapter of the Sadder, it is written, that a man whose good works are more numerous than his sins, will go to paradise; otherwise that he will be thrust into hell, there to remain for ever. It adds, that a bridge erected over the great abyss where hell is situated, leads from this earth to paradise; that upon the bridge there stands an angel, who weighs in a balance the merits of the passengers; that the passenger whose good works are found light in the balance, is thrown over the bridge into hell; but that the passenger whose good works preponderate, proceeds in his journey to paradise, where there is a glorious city, gardens, rivers, and beautiful

tiful virgins, whose looks are a perpetual feast, but who must not be enjoy'd. In the fourth chapter of the Sadder, good works are zealously recommended in the following parable. Zeradusht, or Zoroaster, being in company with God, saw a man in hell who wanted his right foot. "Oh my Creator," said Zoroaster, "who is that man who wants the right foot?" God answered, "He was the king of thirty-three cities, reigned many years, but never did any good, except once, when, seeing a sheep ty'd where it could not reach its food, he with his right foot pushed the food to it; upon which account, that foot was saved from hell." In Japan, those of the Sinto religion believe, that the souls of good men are translated to a place of happiness, next to the habitation of their gods. But they admit no place of torment; nor have they any notion of a devil, but what animates the fox, a very mischievous animal in that country. What then becomes of the souls of ill men? Being denied entrance into heaven, they wander about to expiate their sins. Those of the Budsdo religion believe, that in the other world, there is a place of misery as well as of happiness. Of the latter, there are different degrees, for different degrees of virtue; and yet, far from envying the happier lot of others, every inhabitant is perfectly satisfied with his own. There are also different degrees of misery; for justice requires, that every man be punished according to the nature and number of his sins. *Jemma O* is the severe judge of the wicked: their vices appear to him in all their horror, by means of a mirror, named *the mirror of knowledge*. When souls have expiated their sins, after suffering long in the prison of darkness, they are sent back into the world, to animate serpents, toads, and such vile animals as resembled them in their former existence. From these they pass into the bodies of more innocent animals; and at last are again suffered to enter human bodies; after the dissolution of which, they run the same course of happiness or misery as at first. The people

people of Benin, in Africa, believe a man's shadow to be a real being, that gives testimony after death for or against him; and that he accordingly is made happy or miserable in another world. A religious belief in ancient Greece, that the souls of those who are left above ground without rites, have not access to Elysium, tended to promote humanity; for those who are careful of the dead, will not be altogether indifferent about the living.

Immense are the blessings that men in society reap, from the union of pure religion with sound morality: but however immense, I boldly affirm, that they scarce counterbalance the manifold evils that society has suffered from impure religion, indulging and even encouraging gross immoralities. A few of the most glaring instances shall be selected. The first I shall mention is, the holding religion to consist in the belief of points purely speculative, such as have no relation to good works. The natural effect of that doctrine is, to divorce religion from morality, in manifest contradiction to the will of God. What avails it, for example, to the glory of God, or to the happiness of mankind, whether the conception of the Virgin Mary was maculate or immaculate? The following few instances, taken out of a large heap, are controversies of that kind, which miserably afflicted the Christian church for ages, and engendered the bitterest enmity, raging with destruction and slaughter among brethren of the same religion. In the fifth century, it was the employment of more than one general council, to determine, whether *the mother of God*, or *the mother of Christ*, is the proper epithet of the Virgin Mary. In the sixth century, a bitter controversy arose, whether Christ's body was corruptible. In the seventh century, Christians were divided about the volition of Christ, whether he had one or two Wills, and how his Will operated. In the eighth and ninth centuries, the Greek and Latin churches divided about the Holy Ghost, whether he proceeded from the Father and Son, or only from the Father. In the eleventh century, there

there arose a warm contest between the Greek and Latin churches, about using unleavened bread in the eucharist. In the fourteenth century, it was controverted between Pope John XXII. and the divines of his time, whether souls in their intermediate state see God, or only the human nature of Christ. Franciscans have suffered death in multitudes about the form of their hood. It was disputed between the Dominicans and Franciscans, whether Christ had any property. The Pope pronounced the negative proposition to be a pestilential and blasphemous doctrine, subversive of Catholic faith. Many councils were held at Constantinople, to determine what sort of light it was that the disciples saw on Mount Tabor: it was solemnly pronounced, to be the eternal light with which God is encircled; and which may be termed his energy or operation, but is distinct from his nature and essence. A heap of propositions in the creed of St Athanasius, as far as intelligible, are merely speculative, such as may be adopted or rejected, without the least danger to religion, or to morality; and yet we are commanded to believe every one of them, under the pain of eternal damnation. An endless number of such propositions, adopted by the Romish church, clearly evince, that Christianity was in that church held to consist entirely in belief, without any regard to good works *. Whether the Alcoran was eternal, or whether it was created, is a dispute that has occasioned much effusion of Mahometan blood. The Calif Mamoun, with many doctors, held it to have been created; but the greater number insisted, that being the word of God, it must like him be eternal. This opinion is embraced by the present Mahometants, who hold all who deny it to be infidels. There is among men great uniformity of opinion in

* The great weight that was laid upon orthodoxy, appears from a triumphal arch erected over the tomb of Charlemagne, upon which was the following inscription: "Here lies the body of Charles, a great and orthodox emperor."

matters of importance. Religious differences are generally about trifles, where liberty ought to be indulged without reserve (a); and yet upon these trifles are founded the bitterest enmities. It ought therefore to be a fundamental law in every church, to abstain from loading its creed with articles that are not essential; for such articles tend to eradicate brotherly love, and to convert into bitter enemies, men who are fundamentally of the same faith.

In the next place shall be mentioned, certain articles of faith that tend to sap the very foundation of one or other moral duty. What, for example, can more effectually promote cruelty, than the creed of the Idaans, a people in the island of Borneo, That every person they put to death must attend them as a slave in the other world? This belief makes them prone to war, and occasions assassinations without end. According to the creed of the savages in Canada, the killing and burning enemies are what chiefly entitle them to be happy in another world; and that he who destroys the greatest number, will be the most happy. At the same time, they have no notion of greater happiness there, than plenty of game, great abundance of all things without labour, and full gratification of every sensual appetite. The Scandinavians had no notion of greater bliss in another world, than to drink beer out of the skull of an enemy, in the hall of Woden, their tutelar deity: can hatred and revenge in this world be more honourably rewarded? The doctrine of tutelar deities is equally productive of hatred and revenge: relying on a superior power who espouses all my quarrels, I put no bounds to my resentment, and every moral duty in opposition is trampled under foot. The following creed of the inhabitants of the Marian or Ladrone islands, is a great encouragement to cowardice. Heaven, according to that creed, is a region under the earth, filled with cocoa-trees, sugar-

(a) Elements of Criticism, vol. 2. p. 493. edit. 5.

canes, and variety of other delicious fruits. Hell is a vast furnace, constantly red hot. Their condition in the other world depends not on good or bad actions, but on the manner of their death. Those who die a natural death, go straight to heaven: they may sin freely, if they can but secure their persons against violence. But war and bloodshed are their aversion, because those who suffer a violent death go straight to hell. In many ancient nations, a goddess was worshipped, whose province it was to promote animal love without regard to matrimony. That goddess was in Greece termed *Aphrodité*, in Rome *Venus*, and in Babylon *Mylitta*. To her was sacrificed, in some countries, the virginity of young women; which, it was believed, did secure their chastity for ever after. Justin mentions a custom in the island of Cyprus, of sending young women at stated times to the sea-shore; where they prostituted themselves as a tribute to Venus, that they might be chaste the rest of their lives. His words are, "Pro reliqua pudicitia libamenta Veneri soluturas (a)." In other nations, a small number only were prostituted, in order to secure to the remainder, a chaste and regular life. This explains a custom among the Babylonians, which, far from being thought a religious act, is held as a proof of abandoned debauchery. The custom was, That every woman once in her life should prostitute herself in the temple of the goddess Mylitta. Herodotus reports, that thereby they became proof against all temptation. And Elian observes the same of the Lydian ladies. *Credat Judeus Apella*. Margaret Poretta, who in the fourteenth century made a figure among the Beguines, preached a doctrine not a little favourable to incontinence. She undertook to demonstrate, "That the soul, when absorbed in the love of God, is free from the restraint of law, and may freely gratify every natural appetite, without contract-

(a) Lib. 18. cap. 5.

"ing guilt;" a cordial doctrine for a lady of pleasure. That crazy person, instead of being laugh'd at, was burnt alive at Paris. In the fifteenth century, a sect termed *brethren and sisters of the free spirit*, held, That modesty is a mark of inhering corruption; and that those only are perfect, who can behold nakedness without emotion. These fanatics appeared at public worship, without the least covering. Many tenets professed by the Jesuits, open a door to every immorality. "Persons truly wicked, and void of the love of God, may expect eternal life in heaven; provided only they be impressed with fear of divine anger, and avoid heinous crimes through the dread of future punishment." Again, "Persons may transgress with safety, who have a probable reason for transgressing, such as any plausible argument. A judge, for example, may decide for the least probable side of a question, and even against his own opinion, provided he be supported by any tolerable authority." Again, "Actions intrinsically evil, and contrary to divine law, may however be innocently performed, by those who can join, even ideally, a good end to the performance. For example, an ecclesiastic may safely commit simony, by purchasing a benefice, if to the unlawful act, he join the innocent purpose of procuring to himself a subsistence. A man who runs another through the body for a slight affront, renders the action lawful, if his motive be honour, not revenge." A famous Jesuit taught, that a young man may wish the death of his father, and even rejoice at his death, provided the wish proceed, not from hatred, but from fondness of his father's estate. And another Jesuit has had the effrontery to maintain, that a monk may lawfully assassinate a calumniator, who threatens to charge his order with scandalous practices.

A doctrine that strikes at the root of every moral duty, as well as of religion itself, is, That God will accept a composition for sin;

sin; a doctrine that prevailed universally during the days of ignorance. Compositions for crimes were countenanced by law in every country (a); and men, prone to indulge their passions, flatter'd themselves, that they might compound with God for sinning against him, as with their neighbours for injuring them. Those who have no notion of any motive but interest, naturally think it to be equally powerful with the Deity. An opinion prevailed universally in the Christian church, from the eighth century down to the Reformation, that liberal donations to God, to a saint, to the church, would procure pardon even for the grossest sins. During that period, the building churches and monasteries was in high vogue. This absurd or rather impious doctrine, proved a plentiful harvest of wealth to the clergy; for the great and opulent, who are commonly the boldest finners, have the greatest ability to compound for their sins. There needs nothing but such an opinion, to annihilate every duty, whether moral or religious; for what wicked man will think either of restitution or of reformation, who can purchase a pardon from Heaven with so little trouble? Louis XI. of France was remarkably superstitious, even in a superstitious age. To ingratiate himself with the Virgin Mary, he surrendered to her the county of Boulogne with great solemnity. Voltaire remarks, that godliness consists, not in making the Virgin a Countess, but in abstaining from sin. Composition for sins is a doctrine of the church of Rome, boldly professed without disguise. A book of rates, published by authority of the Pope, contains stated prices for absolutions, not excepting the most heinous sins that men are capable to commit. So true is the observation of Æneas Silvius, afterward Pope Paul II. "Nihil est
 " quod absque argento Romana curia det: ipsa manuum impositio,
 " et Spiritus Sancti dona, venduntur; nec peccatorum venia nisi

(a) Historical Law-tracts, tract 1.

" nummatis

“nummatis impenditur *.” Of all the immoral atonements for sin, human sacrifices are the most brutal; deviating no less from the purity of religion, than from the fundamental principles of morality. They were out of use as kindly affections prevailed; and will never again be restored, unless we fall back to the savage manners of our forefathers. Composition for crimes, once universal, is now banished from every enlightened nation. Composition for sins, was once equally universal; and I wish it could be said, that there are now no remains of that poisonous opinion among Christians: the practice of the church of Rome will not permit it to be said. Were men deeply convinced, as they ought to be, that sincere repentance and reformation of manners are the only means for obtaining pardon, they would never dream of making bargains with the Almighty, and of compounding with him for their sins.

In the practice of religion, the laying too great weight on forms, ceremonies, and other external arbitrary acts, has an unhappy tendency on morality. That error has infected every religion. The Sadder, the Bible of the Gaures, prohibits calumny and detraction, lying, stealing, adultery, and fornication. It however enervates morality and religion, by placing many trifling acts on a level with the most important duties. It enjoins the destruction of five kinds of reptiles, frogs, mice, ants, serpents, and flies that sting. It teaches, that to walk barefoot profanes the ground. Great regard for water is enjoined: it must not be used during the night; and when set upon the fire, a third part of the pot must be empty, to prevent boiling over. The bramins have wofully degenerated from their original institutions, thinking at

“There is nothing to be obtained from the court of Rome, but by the force of money: even the ceremony of consecration, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, are sold; and the remission of sins is bestowed only on those who can pay for it.”

present,

present, that religion consists in forms and ceremonies. As soon as an infant is born, the word *Oum* must be pronounced over it; otherwise it will be eternally miserable: its tongue must be rubbed with consecrated meal: the third day of the moon, it must be carried into open air, with its head to the north. The inhabitants of Formosa believe in hell; but it is only for punishing those who fail to go naked in certain seasons, or who wear cotton instead of silk. In the time of Ghenhizcan, it was held in Tartary a mortal sin, to put a knife into the fire, to whip a horse with his bridle, or to break one bone with another; and yet these pious Tartars held treachery, robbery, murder, to be no sins. A faction in Ægina, a Greek commonwealth, treacherously assassinated seven hundred of their fellow-citizens. They cut off the hands of a miserable fugitive, who had laid hold of the altar for protection, in order to murder him without the precincts of the temple. Their treacherous assassinations made no impression: but tho' they refrained from murder in the temple, yet by profaning it with blood, says Herodotus, they offended the gods, and contracted inexpiable guilt. Would one believe, that a tribunal was established by Charlemagne more horrible than the inquisition itself? It was established in Westphalia, to punish with death every Saxon who eat meat in lent. The same law was established in Flanders and in French-county, the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Listen to a celebrated writer upon that poisonous conceit. "It is certain, that in every religion, however sublime, many of the votaries, perhaps the greatest number, will still seek the divine favour, not by virtue and good morals, which alone can be acceptable to a perfect being, but either by frivolous observances, by intemperate zeal, by rapturous ecstasies, or by the belief of mysterious and absurd opinions. When the old Romans were attacked with a pestilence, they never ascribed their sufferings

“ sufferings to their vices, or dreamed of repentance and amend-
 “ ment. They never thought that they were the general robbers
 “ of the world, whose ambition and avarice made desolate the
 “ earth, and reduced opulent nations to want and beggary. They
 “ only created a dictator in order to drive a nail into a door; and
 “ by that means they thought that they had sufficiently appeased
 “ their incensed deity (a).” Thus, gradually, the essentials of
 religion wear out of mind, by the attention given to forms and
 ceremonies: these intercept and exhaust the whole stock of de-
 votion, which ought to be reserved for the higher exercises of reli-
 gion. The neglect or transgression of mere punctilios, are punish-
 ed as heinous sins; while sins really heinous are suffered to pass
 with impunity. The Jews exalted the keeping their sabbath holy,
 above every other duty; and it was the general belief, that the
 strict observance of that day was alone sufficient to atone for every
 sin. The command of resting that day, was taken so literally,
 that they would not on that day defend themselves even against an
 assassin. Ptolomy, son of Lagus, entered Jerusalem on the Jewish
 sabbath, in a hostile manner without resistance. Nor did experience
 open the eyes of that foolish people. Xiphilin, relating the siege
 of Jerusalem by Pompey, says, that if the Jews had not rested
 on the sabbath, Pompey would not have been successful. Every
 Saturday he renewed his batteries; and having on that day made
 a breach, he marched into the town without opposition. One
 cannot help smiling at an Amsterdam Jew, who had no check of
 conscience, for breaking open a house, and carrying off money;
 and yet being stopped in his flight by the sabbath before he got
 out of the territory, he most piously rested, till he was apprehend-
 ed, and led to the gallows. Nor are the Jews to this day cured
 of that frenzy. In some late accounts from Constantinople, a fire

(a) Natural History of Religion, by David Hume, Esquire.

broke

broke out in a Jew's house on Saturday: rather than profane the sabbath, he suffered the flames to spread, which occasioned the destruction of five hundred houses *. We laugh at the Jews, and we have reason; and yet there are many well-meaning Protestants, who lay the whole of religion upon punctual attendance at public worship. Are the Roman Catholics less superstitious with respect to the place of worship, than the Jews are with respect to the day of worship? In the year 1670, some Arabians, watching an opportunity, got into the town of Dieu when the gates were opened in the morning. They might easily have been expelled by the canon of the citadel; but the Portuguese governor was obliged to look on without firing a gun, being threatened with excommunication, if the least mischief should be done to any of the churches. The only doctrines inculcated from the Romish pulpit down to the Reformation, were the authority of holy mother church; the merit of the saints, and their credit in the court of heaven; the dignity, glory, and love of the blessed Virgin; the efficacy of relics; the intolerable fire of purgatory; and the vast importance of indulgences. Relying on such pious acts for obtaining remission of sins, all orders of men rushed headlong into vice †; nor was there

* " And there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together. And Jesus laid his hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue with indignation said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath-day. The Lord then said, Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? and ought not this woman, whom Satan hath bound, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath-day?" *Luke, xiii. 11.*

† An ingenious writer pleasantly observes, " That a croisade was the South-sea project of former times: by the latter, men hoped to gain riches without indu-

a single attempt to stem the current of immorality ; for the traffic of indulgences could not but flourish in proportion to the growth of sin. And thus was religion set in direct opposition to morality. St Eloy, bishop of Noyon in the seventh century, and canonized by the church of Rome, delivers the following doctrine. “ He is a good Christian who goes frequently to church ; who presents his oblations upon the altar ; who tastes not the fruit of his own industry till part be consecrated to God ; who, when the holy festivals approach, lives chastely even with his own wife for several days ; and who can repeat the creed and the Lord’s prayer. Redeem then your souls from destruction, while you have the means in your power : offer presents and tithes to churchmen : come more frequently to church : humbly implore the patronage of saints. If you observe these things, you may, in the day of judgement, go with confidence to the tribunal of the eternal Judge, and say, Give to us, O Lord, for we have given unto thee.” A modern author subjoins a proper observation. “ We see here a very ample description of a good Christian, in which there is not the least mention of the love of God, resignation to his will, obedience to his laws, nor of justice, benevolence, nor charity.” Gross ignorance and wretched superstition prevailed so much even in the fourteenth century, that people reckoned themselves secure of salvation, if at the day of judgement they could show any connection with monks. Many at the point of death, made it their last request, to be admitted into the mendicant order, or to be interred in their burial-place. Religion need not associate with morality, if such silly practices be sufficient for obtaining the favour of

“ fly : by the former, they hoped to gain heaven without repentance, amendment of life, or sanctity of manners.” *Sir David Dalrymple, a judge in the court of session.*

God.

God. Is this less absurd than the Hindostan belief, That the water of the Ganges hath a sanctifying virtue; and that those who die on its banks, are not only exempted from future punishment, but are wafted straight to paradise?

Forms and ceremonies are visible acts, which make a deep impression on the vulgar. Hence their influence in reasoning and in morality, as we have seen in the two sketches immediately foregoing; and hence also their influence in religion. Forms and ceremonies are useful at public worship; but they ought not to take place of essentials. People however, governed by what they see and hear, are more addicted to external acts of devotion, than to heart-worship, which is not known but by reflection.

It will be no excuse for relying so much on forms and ceremonies, that they are innocent. In themselves they may be innocent; but not so in their consequences. For they have by such reliance a violent tendency to relax the obligations of morality. Religious rites that contradict not any passion, are keenly embraced, and punctually performed; and men, flattering themselves that they have thus been punctual in their duty to God, give vent to their passions against men. "They pay tithes of mint, and anise, and cummin; but omit the weightier matters of the law, judgement, mercy, and faith (a)." Upon such a man religion sits extremely light. As he seldom exercises any act of genuine devotion, he thinks of the Deity with ease and familiarity: how otherwise is it accountable, that the plays, termed *Mysteries*, could be relished, where mean and perhaps dissolute persons are brought on the stage, acting Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, and even God himself? These divine persons were certainly not more regarded, than the Grecian gods, who frequently made part of the *Dramatis personæ* in Greek plays. Many other facts might be urged, to prove the low ebb of reli-

(v) Matthew, xxiii. 23.

gion in those days: I select one or two, which probably will afford some amusement to the reader. Bartolus, the famous lawyer, in order to shew the form of proceeding in a court of justice, imagines a process between the devil and mankind. The devil cites mankind to appear at the tribunal of Jesus Christ, claiming them as belonging to him by Adam's fall. He swells in rage, demanding whether any one dares appear in their behalf. Against the Virgin Mary, offering herself as their advocate, the devil makes two objections; first, That being the mother of the Judge, her influence would be too great; second, That a woman is debarred from being an advocate: and these objections are supported by numberless quotations from the *Corpus Juris*. The Virgin, on her part, quotes texts permitting women to appear for widows, orphans, and for persons in distress. She is allowed to plead for mankind, as coming under the last article. The devil urges prescription, as having been in possession of mankind ever since the fall. The Virgin answers, That a *mala-fide possessor* cannot acquire by prescription. Prescription being repelled, the parties go to the merits of the cause, which are learnedly discussed with texts from the Pandects. The memoirs of the French academy of Belles Lettres (a) has the following story. A monk returning from a house which he durst not visit in day-light, had a river to cross. The boat was overturned by Satan, and the monk was drowned when he was beginning to invoke the Virgin Mary. Two devils having laid hold of his soul, were stopped by two angels. "My Lords," said the devils, "true it is, and not a fable, that God died for his friends; but this monk was an enemy to God, and we are carrying him to hell." After much altercation, it was proposed by the angels, to refer the dispute to the Virgin Mary. The devils were willing to accept of God for judge, because he would judge according to law. "But from the Virgin Mary,"

(a) Vol. 18.

said they, "we expect no justice: she would break to atoms every gate of hell, rather than suffer one to remain there a moment who pays any worship to her image. She may say, that black is white, and that puddled water is pure. — God never contradicts her. The day on which God made his mother, was a fatal day to us."

People who profess the same religion, and differ only in forms and ceremonies, may justly be compared to neighbouring states, who are commonly bitter enemies to each other, if they have any difference. At the same time, dissocial passions never rage so furiously, as under the mask of religion; for in that case they are held to be meritorious, as exerted in the cause of God. This observation is but too well verified in the disputes among Christians. However low religion was in the dark ages, yet men fought for forms and ceremonies as *pro aris et focis*. In the Armenian form of baptism, the priest says at the first immersion, *In name of the Father*; at the second, *In name of the Son*; at the third, *In name of the Holy Ghost*. This form is bitterly condemned by the Romish church, which appoints the three persons of the Trinity to be joined in the same expression, in token of their union. Strahlenberg gives an account of a Christian sect in Russia, which differs from the established Greek church in the following particulars. First, In public worship they repeat *Halleluia* but twice; and it is a mortal sin to repeat it thrice. Second, In celebrating mass, not five but seven loaves ought to be used. Third, The cross stamped upon a mass-loaf ought to have eight corners. Fourth, In signing with the cross at prayers, the end of the ring-finger must be joined to the end of the thumb, and the two intermediate fingers be held out at full length. How trifling are these differences! and yet for such differences, all who dissent from them are held unclean, and no better than Pagans: they will not eat nor drink with any of the established church; and if

a person of that church happen to sit down in a house of theirs, they wash and purify the seat *. There are few sects founded upon more trivial differences than the Turkish and Persian Mahometans. The epithets given to the Persians by the Turks are, "Forfaken of God, Abominable, Blasphemers of the Holy Prophet;" and so bitter is their enmity to the Persians, that the schools of the *seraglio* are open to young men of all nations, those of Persia alone excepted. The Persians are held to be such apostates from the true faith, as to be utterly past recovery: they receive no quarter in war, being accounted unworthy of life or slavery. Nor do the Persians yield to the Turks in hatred. Whether coffee be or be not prohibited in the *Alcoran*, has produced much controversy in the Mahometan church, and consequently much persecuting zeal. A *mufti*, not fond of coffee, declared it, like wine, to have an inebriating quality, and therefore was virtually prohibited by Mahomet. Another *mufti*, fond of coffee for its exhilarating virtue, declared it lawful; "because," said he, "all things are lawful that are not expressly prohibited in the *Alcoran*." The coffeehouses in Constantinople, were for a long period alternately opened and shut, according to the taste of the reigning *mufti*; till coffee at last, surmounting all obstacles, came to be an established Mahometan liquor. Religion thus runs wild, whenever it loses sight of its true ends, that of worshipping God, and that of being just to man. The Hindows hate the Mahometans for eating the flesh of cows: the Mahometans hate the Hindows for eating the flesh of swine. The aversion that men of

* Christians, occupy'd too much with external forms, have corrupted several of the fine arts. They have injured architecture, by erecting magnificent churches in the ugly form of a cross. And they have injured painting, by withdrawing the best hands from proper subjects, and employing them on the legendary martyrdom of pretended saints, and other such disagreeable stories.

the same religion have at each other for the most trivial differences, converts them frequently into brutal savages. Suppose, for example, that a poor man, reduced to the extremity of hunger, makes a greedy meal of a dead horse, a case so deplorable would wring every heart. And yet, let this be done in Lent, or on a meagre day — Behold! every zealot is instantly metamorphos'd into a devil incarnate. In the records of St Claude, a small district of Burgundy, is engrossed a sentence against a poor gentleman named *Claude Guillon*. The words are, “ Having considered the process, and taken advice of the doctors of law, we declare the said Claude Guillon duly convicted for having carried away and boiled a piece of a dead horse, and of having eat the same on the 31st March, being Saturday.” And he was beheaded accordingly 28th July 1629; notwithstanding a defence above all exception, That he committed that irregularity to preserve his life. How was it possible for the monsters to persuade themselves, that this sentence was agreeable to God, who is goodness itself!

No less prejudicial to morality, than the relying too much on forms and ceremonies, is the treating some sins with great severity; neglecting others equally heinous, or perhaps more so. In a book of rates for absolution, mentioned above, no just distinction is made among sins; some venial sins being taxed at a higher rate than many of the deepest dye. For example, the killing father, mother, brother, sister, or wife, is taxed at five gros; and the same for incest with a mother or sister. The lying with a woman in the church is taxed at six gros; and at the same time, absolution for usury is taxed at seven gros, and for simony at no less than sixteen gros*.

A maxim adopted by many pious persons, has a smiling ap-

* A gros is the third part of a ducat.

pearance,

pearance, but in its consequences is hurtful both to religion and morality; which is, That to testify our veneration for the Deity, and zeal for his service, the performing public and private worship, and the fulfilling moral duties, are not alone sufficient; that over and above we are bound to fast, to do penance, to honour the priesthood, and to punish the enemies of God, *i. e.* those who differ from us in principles or practice. This maxim, which may be termed *the doctrine of supererogation*, is finely illustrated by an author mentioned above. “ The duties which a man performs
 “ as a friend or parent, seem merely owing to his benefactor or
 “ children; nor can he be wanting to these duties without break-
 “ ing through all the ties of nature and morality. A strong in-
 “ clination may prompt him to the performance: a sentiment of
 “ order and moral beauty joins its force to these natural ties:
 “ and the whole man is drawn to his duty without any effort or
 “ endeavour. Even with regard to the virtues which are more
 “ austere, and more founded on reflection, such as public spirit,
 “ filial duty, temperance, or integrity: the moral obligation, in
 “ our apprehension, removes all pretence to religious merit: and
 “ the virtuous conduct is esteemed no more than what we owe
 “ to society, and to ourselves. In all this, a superstitious man
 “ finds nothing which he has properly performed for the sake of
 “ his Deity, or which can peculiarly recommend him to the di-
 “ vine favour and protection. He considers not, that the most
 “ genuine method of serving the Divinity is, by promoting the
 “ happiness of his creatures. He still looks out for some more
 “ immediate service of the supreme Being: and any practice re-
 “ commended to him, which either serves to no purpose in life,
 “ or offers the strongest violence to his natural inclinations; that
 “ practice he will the more readily embrace, on account of those
 “ very circumstances, which should make him absolutely reject
 “ it. It seems the more purely religious, that it proceeds from
 “ no

“no mixture of any other motive or consideration. And if for its
 “sake he sacrifices much of his ease and quiet, his claim of merit
 “appears still to rise upon him, in proportion to the zeal and devotion
 “which he discovers. In restoring a loan, or paying a debt, his
 “divinity is no wise beholden to him; because these acts of justice
 “are what he was bound to perform, and what many would
 “have performed, were there no God in the universe. But if he
 “fast a day, or give himself a sound whipping, this has a direct
 “reference, in his opinion, to the service of God. No other mo-
 “tive could engage him to such austerities. By these distinguish-
 “ed marks of devotion, he has now acquired the divine favour;
 “and may expect in recompense, protection and safety in this
 “world, and eternal happiness in the next (a).” My yoke is
 easy, saith our Saviour, and my burden is light. So they really
 are. Every essential of religion is founded on our nature, and to
 a pure heart is pleasant in the performance: what can be more
 pleasant, than gratitude to our Maker, and obedience to his will
 in comforting our fellow-creatures? But enthusiasts are not ea-
 sily persuaded, that to make ourselves happy in the exercises of
 piety and benevolence, is the most acceptable service to God that
 we can perform. In loading religion with unnecessary articles of
 faith and practice, they contradict our Saviour, by making his
 yoke severe, and his burden heavy *. Law, upon Christian per-
 fection, enjoins such unnatural austerity of manners, as to be sub-
 versive both of religion and morality: loose education is not
 more so. Our passions, when denied their proper exercise, are
 apt to break their fetters, and to plunge us into every extrava-

* An old woman walking with others to a sacrament, was observed to pick out the worst bits of the road: “I never can do enough,” said she, “for sweet Jesus.”

(a) Natural History of Religion.

gance: like the body, which squeezed in one part, swells the more in another. In the same way of thinking, the pious Jeremy Taylor, treating of mortification, prescribes it as the indispensable duty of a Christian, to give no indulgence even to the most innocent emotions; because, says he, the most indifferent action becomes sinful, when there is no other motive for the performance but barely its being pleasant. Could a malevolent deity contrive any thing more severe against his votaries?

In the same spirit of supererogation, holidays have been multiplied without end, depriving the working poor of time, that would be more usefully employ'd in providing bread for themselves and families. Such a number of holidays, beside contradicting Providence, which framed us more for action than contemplation, have several poisonous effects with respect to morality. The moral sense has great influence on the industrious, who have no time for indulging their irregular appetites: the idle, on the contrary, are obvious to every temptation. Men likewise are apt to assume great merit from a rigid observance of holidays and other ceremonies; and having thus acquired, in their opinion, the favour of God, they rely on his indulgence in other matters which they think too sweet for sinners.

Monastic institutions are an improvement upon holidays: the whole life of a monk is intended to be a holiday, dedicated entirely to the service of God. The idleness of the monastic state among Christians, opens a wide door to immorality.

In the third section, penances are handled as a mode of worship, for obtaining pardon of sin. But they are sometimes submitted to by the innocent, in order to procure from the Almighty still more favour than innocence alone is entitled to; in which view they are evidently a work of supererogation. They seem to have no bad effect with respect to religion, as distinguished from morality: the body is indeed cruciated unnecessarily; but if enthusiasts

thusiasts voluntarily submit to bodily distresses, they have themselves only to blame. With respect to morality, their bad tendency is not slight. Those who perform extraordinary acts of devotion, conceive themselves peculiarly entitled to the favour of God. Proud of his favour, they attach themselves to him alone, and turn indifferent about every other duty. The favourite of a terrestrial potentate, assumes authority; and takes liberties that private persons dare not venture upon: shall a favourite of Heaven be less indulged? The Faquirs in Hindostan submit to dreadful penances; and, holding themselves secure of God's favour, they are altogether indifferent about the duty they owe to their neighbour. So much are they above common decency, as to go about naked, not even concealing what modesty forbids us to expose. The penances enjoined in the Romish church, such as fasting and flagellation, have evidently the same bad tendency*. With respect to fasting in particular, to what good purpose it can serve, except to gluttons, is not readily conceived. Temperance in eating and drinking is essential to health: too much or too little are equally noxious, tho' their effects are different. Fasting therefore ought never to be enjoined to the temperate as a religious duty, because it cannot be acceptable to a benevolent Deity. Listen to a great prophet on that subject. "Behold, ye fast for
 "strife and debate, and to smite with the fist of wickedness; ye
 "shall not fast as ye do this day, to make your voice to be heard
 "on high. Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man
 "to afflict his soul? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush,
 "and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Wilt thou call

* A sect of Christians, styled *Flagellantes*, held, that flagellation is of equal virtue with baptism and the other sacraments; that it will procure forgiveness of sin; that the old law of Christ is to be abolished, and a new law substituted; enjoining the baptism of blood to be administered by whipping.

"this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord? Is not this the
 "fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to
 "undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and
 "that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the
 "hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out, to thy
 "house? when thou see'st the naked, that thou cover him, and
 "that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh (a)?"

The most extraordinary penance of all, is celibacy considered as a religious duty. Many fathers of the church declare against matrimony. St Jerom in particular says, That the end of matrimony is eternal death; that the earth indeed is filled by it, but heaven by virginity. The intemperate zeal of many primitive Christians led them to abstain from matrimony, and even from conjugal caresses, if they had the misfortune to be married; believing that the carnal appetite is inconsistent with pure religion. Edward the Confessor was fainted, for no better reason than the abstaining from matrimonial duties. Jovinian, in the fourth century, taught, that all who observe the laws of piety and virtue laid down in the gospel, have an equal title to happiness in another life: consequently, that those who pass their days in celibacy and mortification, are in no respect more acceptable to God than those who live virtuously in marriage without mortification. He published his opinions in a book, against which Jerom wrote a bitter and abusive treatise, still extant. These opinions were condemned by the church, and by St Ambrose, in a council at Milan; and Jovinian was banished by the Emperor Honorius. Such ridiculous self-denial was not confined to Christians. Strabo mentions a sect among the Thracians, who made a vow of perpetual virginity; and were much respected on that account. Garcilasso mentions virgins in Peru consecrated to the sun: a vestal guilty of

(a) Isaiah, lviii. 4. &c.

frailty was buried alive, her lover hanged, and the inhabitants of the town where she lived put to the sword. Among all the absurd acts of mortification, the present affords the strongest instance of superstition triumphing over common sense; for what can be more inconsistent with common sense, not to talk of religion, than an endeavour to put an end to the human species? Some glimpses of reason have abated the zeal of enthusiasts for celibacy; but have not totally extirpated it, for celibacy of the clergy remains to this day a law in the Romish church. It cannot however seriously be thought the will of our benevolent God, that his priests should be denied the exercise of natural powers, bestowed on all for a most valuable purpose. This impious restraint, which contradicts the great law of *Increase and multiply*, has opened the door to gross debauchery in the pastors of the Romish church, tho' ecclesiastics ought of all men to be the most circumspect in their conduct. Men restrained from what is necessary and proper, are more prone than others to break out into gross irregularities*. Marriage is warmly recommended in the laws of Zoroaster. Children are said to be a bridge that conducts men to heaven; and a man who has no children, is held to be under the power of Ahriman. The prayer of a priest who has no children, is held disagreeable to Ormusd.

The celibacy of the clergy was countenanced by the Pope; and enforced from a political consideration, That it united the whole

* An ingenious writer, mentioned above, makes the following observation: "The celibacy of ecclesiastics was originally introduced by some superstitious refinements on the law of God and nature. Could men have been kept alive without eating or drinking, as well as without marriage, the same refinements would have prohibited ecclesiastics from eating and drinking, and thereby have elevated them so much nearer to the state of angels. In process of time, this fatal interdiction became an instrument of worldly wisdom: and thus, as frequently happens, what weak men began, politicians completed." *Sir David Dalrymple.*

clergy

clergy into one firm body under his spiritual Majesty. How short-sighted is man! It was justly esteemed at the time to be the corner-stone of Papal power; and yet became the chief cause of its downfall. Celibacy precipitated the Romish clergy into adultery, fornication, cunning, dissimulation, and every secret vice. Will men of such manners be listened to, when they preach purity to their hearers? There was no medium, but either to reform their own manners, or to give every indulgence to the laity. But the ignorance and superstition of the latter, rendered the former secure in their own opinion. The restoration of learning broke the charm. Men beginning to think for themselves, were provoked at the dissolute lives of their pastors, and raised a loud cry against them, not yet thinking of their doctrines. Reformers were burnt as heretics; and clergymen were held to be emissaries from Satan, to establish his throne upon earth. Knox, that violent reformer, believed seriously, that Cardinal Beaton was a *conjured enemy to Christ Jesus*. Providence brings good out of ill. Had not the clergy been dissolute, poor Christians might have laboured under ignorance and ecclesiastical thralldom to this hour. Our reformers, beginning with their pastors, extended insensibly their hatred to the doctrines taught by their pastors. Every article of faith was sifted: the chaff was separated from the corn; and a reformation was established upon the scriptures, rejecting every innovation of the Romish church.

There is not mentioned in history a more impudent attack upon moral principles, than a privilege assumed by the Bishop of Rome, to disengage men from their oaths and promises: it is not a greater stretch to disengage them from every duty, whether of morality or of religion. The barons of Valentia, dreading a persecution against the industrious Moors, their tenants, obtained the following clause to be inserted in their king's coronation-oath: "That he should not expell the Moriscos, nor force them to be
" baptized;

“baptized; that he should never desire to be relieved from the oath by a dispensation from the Pope, nor accept a dispensation if offered.” The Emperor Charles V. took this oath solemnly in presence of his nobles; and yet accepted a dispensation from the Pope, absolving him from the oath, and from the guilt of perjury in breaking it. Augustus King of Poland, in the treaty of Altramstadt, renounced the kingdom of Poland to his competitor Stanislaus. The defeat of the King of Sweden at Poltowa, was an inviting opportunity to renew his pretensions. A solemn treaty stood in his way; but the Pope removed that obstacle, by annulling the treaty, and setting him at liberty. The Pope has been known even to bestow that wonderful privilege upon others. Pope Pascal II. having with a solemn oath renounced the right of investitures, empowered the cardinals to declare his oath null. Bishops also, imitating their superior, have assumed the privilege of dispensing with moral duties. Instances are not rare, of curates being authorized by their bishop to entertain concubines, paying for each a regular tax of a crown yearly. Nay, in some provincial synods, they are enjoined to keep concubines, in order to prevent scandal. Common prostitutes, licensed in the city of Leghorn, have a church peculiar to themselves, and must not enter into any other. They follow their trade with the utmost freedom; except in passion-week, during which they must forbear sinning, under pain of banishment.

The power of bestowing kingdoms, assumed by the Bishop of Rome, was an encroachment on the rules of justice, no less bold. Christian princes, not many ages ago, esteemed the Pope's gift to be their best title of property. In the 1346, the Venetians requested the Pope's permission to carry on commerce in Asia, and to purchase there pepper and cinnamon. The Pope not only granted their request, but pronounced anathemas upon any who should dare to interfere in that commerce. Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain,

Spain, applied to Pope Alexander VI. to vest in them the property of America, discovered under their auspices by Columbus. The Pope having formerly made a grant to the kings of Portugal, of their discoveries in the East Indies, both grants were held sacred; and it came to be strenuously disputed, under which of the grants the Molucca islands were comprehended. Both grants proceed upon a narrative, of the power bestowed by Almighty God on the Pope as successor to St Peter and vicar of Christ. To imagine, that the Almighty would bestow such powers on the Bishop of Rome, or on any human being, shews gross ignorance of the common rights of mankind, and of the government of Providence.

The grossest of all deviations, not only from sound morality but from pure religion, and the most extensive in its baneful effects, is a doctrine embraced by established churches, not many excepted, That because heretics are odious in the sight of God, it is the duty of the orthodox to extirpate them root and branch. Observe the consequence: people who differ from the established church, are held to be obstinate sinners, deserving punishment here as well as hereafter. The religion of every country is changeable; and the religion at present dominant may soon be under depression; which of course subjects all mankind to the rigour of persecution. An invention more effectual for extirpating the human race, is not within the reach of human powers: the horror of human sacrifices is as nothing in comparison.

The old Romans, far from having any notion of persecution, adopted the gods of every nation they conquered. A learned writer (a) observes, that as the number of their gods increased with their conquests, it is possible that they might have worshipped all the gods in the world. Their belief in tutelar deities produced

(a) Morinus,

that

that effect. Titus Livius mentions a sect of Bacchanals that spread through Italy. They performed their ceremonies during night, men and women mixing in the dark after intemperate eating and drinking. Never did wicked wretches deserve more exemplary punishment; yet listen to the following decree of the Roman senate, breathing the true spirit of toleration. "Ne qua Bacchanalia Romæ, neve in Italia essent. Si quis tale sacrum, solenne, et necessarium duceret, nec sine religione et piaculo se id omittere posse; apud prætorem urbanum profiteretur; prætor senatum consuleret. Si ei permissum esset, quum in senatu centum non minus essent; ita id sacrum faceret, dum ne plus quinque sacrificio interessent; neu qua pecunia communis, neu quis magister sacrorum, aut sacerdos esset *." The Jews however were prone to persecution; for tho' they considered the supreme being as their tutelar deity, yet the malignity of their nature prevailed to make them hold in abhorrence the worship of every other god. Even among themselves, they were abundantly disposed to war; and nothing kept within bounds the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, their three sects, but terror of the Roman power. The Christian religion implies toleration in its very nature and principles; but being corrupted by ignorance, interest, and superstition, it became prone to persecution above all others. Christian sects were enflamed against each other to a degree of bruta-

* "Let there be no Bacchanalian ceremonies performed in the city, nor within Italy. If there be any person who reckons it a matter of conscience to perform these rites, and that he ought not to omit them, let him state his opinion to the city-prætor, who shall thereupon consult the senate. If liberty be granted him by the senate when no fewer than a hundred senators are present, let him perform the sacrifice, but privately, in presence of no greater number than five persons. Let there be no public fund for them, nor any who shall preside as priest or master of the rites."

lity ; the most opposite to peace and brotherly love, inculcated in the gospel. It was propagated by the orthodox, that Arius expired in a common jakes, and that his intrails burst out. The same is related of Huneric King of the Vandals, a zealous Arian ; with the following addition, that being possessed with the devil, whom he had glutted with the blood of many martyrs, he tore his flesh off with his teeth, and ended his wretched life in the most excruciating, tho' justly deserved, torments. The falsehoods every where spread during the fourteenth century against the Jews, such as their poisoning the public fountains, killing Christian infants, and drinking their blood, with many other falsehoods of the same stamp, were invented and greedily swallowed through the influence of religious hatred. The greater part of persecutions have been occasioned in the same manner ; for men are not so desperately wicked, as to approve of persecution, unless when blinded by intemperate zeal. The same religious hatred produced the assassination of the Duke of Guise, and of two Henries, Kings of France ; produced the gun-powder plot ; and produced the most horrid deed that ever was perpetrated among men, the massacre of St Bartholomew *.

No false principle in religion has shed more innocent, or rather virtuous blood, than that of persecuting heretics ; *i. e.* those who differ in any article from the religion established by law. The doctrine of burning heretics, is in effect the professing to burn

* Monsieur de Tavannes, afterward Marechal of France, was a great partisan of the Queen-mother, and so active in the massacre, that with his own hand he murdered no fewer than seventeen Huguenots. Having on deathbed made a full confession of his sins, "What," said the priest, "not a word of St Bartholomew ?" "Of St Bartholomew !" answered the penitent ; "the service I did that memorable day to God and the church, is alone a sufficient atonement for all my transgressions."

men highly virtuous ; for they must be so in an eminent degree, who submit to be burnt alive, rather than be guilty even of dissimulation. The Mahometan practice of converting people by the sword, if not more rational, is at least more manly. Louis IX. of France, one of its best princes, would have been a greater blessing to his people, had he been less pious : he had an implacable aversion to heretics, against whom he thought it more proper to employ racks and gibbets, than argument and persuasion. Torquemada, that infernal inquisitor of Spain, brought into the inquisition, in the space of fourteen years, no fewer than 80,000 persons ; of whom 6000 were condemned to the flames, and burnt alive with the greatest pomp and exultation. Of that vast number, there was perhaps not a single person, who was not more pure in religion, as well as in morals, than their outrageous persecutor. Hunter, a young man about nineteen years of age, was one of the unhappy victims to the zeal of Queen Mary of England for Popery. Having been inadvertently betray'd by a priest to deny transubstantiation, he absconded, to keep out of harm's way. Bonner, that arch-hangman of Popery, threatened ruin to the father, if he did not deliver up the young man. Hunter, hearing of his father's danger, made his appearance ; and was burnt alive, instead of being rewarded for his filial piety. A woman of Guernsey was brought to the stake, without regard to her big belly ; which bursting by the torture, she was delivered in the midst of the flames. One of the guards snatched the infant from the fire : but the magistrate who attended the execution, ordered it to be thrown back ; being resolved, he said, that nothing should survive which sprung from a parent so obstinately heretical. Father Paul (Council of Trent, book 5.) computes, that in the Netherlands alone, from the time that the edict of Charles V. was promulgated against the reformers, fifty thousand persons were hanged,

beheaded, buried alive, or burnt, on account of religion. Some Faquirs, crazed with opium and fanaticism, have been known with poisoned daggers to fall upon uncircumcised Europeans, and to put every one to death whom they could master. In the last century, a faquir at Surate murdered, within the space of a minute, seventeen Dutch sailors with seventeen stabs of a dagger. We think with horror of human sacrifices among the ancient Pagans; and yet we behold them every day among Christians, rendered still more horrid by the most atrocious torments that religious hatred can devise.

The great motive to such cruelties, is the superstitious and absurd notion, that heretics are God's enemies; which makes it thought an acceptable service to God, not only to persecute them by fire and sword in this world, but to deliver them over to Satan in the world to come. Another circumstance enflames religious hatred; which is, that neighbours are either intimate friends or bitter enemies. This holds with a slight variation in sects of the same religion: however minute their differences be, they cannot be intimate friends; and therefore are bitter enemies: the nearer they approach to unison, if not entirely concordant, the greater in proportion is their mutual hatred. Such hatred, subduing the meek spirit of Christianity, is an additional cause for persecution. Blind zeal for what is believed to be the only true religion, never discovers error nor innocence in those who differ, but perverseness and criminal obstinacy. Two religions totally different, like two countries in opposite parts of the globe, produce no mutual enmity. At the siege of Constantinople by the Turks, ann. 1453, the Emperor, in order to procure assistance from the princes of the Latin church, ordered mass to be celebrated in one of his churches according to the form used in Rome. The people with great indignation protested, that they would rather see the Turks in their churches, than the hat of a cardinal.

The

The history of the Waldenses, tho' well known, cannot be too often repeated. In the twelfth century, a merchant of Lyons, named *Peter Valdo*, dissatisfied with the pomp and ceremonies of the Romish church, ill suited, in his opinion, to the humility of a Christian, retired to a desert in the high country of Provence, with several poor people his disciples. There he became their spiritual guide, instructing them in certain doctrines, the same that were afterward adopted by the Protestants. Their incessant labour subdued the barren soil, and prepared it for grain as well as for pasture. The rent which in time they were enabled to pay for land that afforded none originally, endeared them to their landlords. In 250 years, they multiplied to the number of 18,000, occupying thirty villages, beside hamlets, the work of their own hands. Priests they had none, nor any disputes about religion: neither had they occasion for a court of justice, as brotherly love did not suffer them to go to law: they worshipped God in their own plain way, and their innocence was secured by incessant labour. They had long enjoy'd the sweets of peace and mutual affection, when the reformers of Germany and Geneva sent ministers among them; which unhappily laid them open to religious hatred, the most unrelenting of all furies. In the year 1540, the parliament of Provence condemned nineteen of them to be burnt for heresy, their trees to be rooted up, and their houses to be raz'd to the ground. The Waldenses, terrified at this sentence, applied in a body to Cardinal Sadolet, bishop of Carpentras; who received them kindly, and obtained from Francis I. of France, a pardon for the persons under sentence of death, on condition of abjuring heresy. The matter lay over five years; when the parliament, irritated at them for persevering in their tenets, prevailed on the King to withdraw his pardon. The sentence was executed with great rigour; and the parliament, laying hold of that opportunity,

portunity, broke through every restraint of law, and commenced a violent persecution against the whole nation. The soldiers began with massacring old men, women, and children, all having fled who were able to fly; and proceeded to burn their houses, barns, and corn. There remained in the town of Cabriere sixty men and thirty women; who having surrendered upon promise of life, were butchered each of them without mercy. Some women who had taken refuge in a church, were dragged out, and burnt alive. Twenty-two villages were reduced to ashes; and that populous and flourishing district, became once more a desert.

To conceive this horrid scene in all its deformity, the people persecuted ought to be compared with the clergy their persecutors; for the civil magistrate was the hand only that executed their vengeance: on the one side, an industrious people, pure in their morals, and no less pure in their religion: on the other, proud pampered priests, abandoned without shame to every wickedness, impure in their morals, and still more impure in their religion—the world never furnished such another contrast. Had the scene been reversed, to make these wretches suffer persecution from the Waldenses—but that people were too upright and too religious for being persecutors. The manners of the Christian clergy in general, before the Reformation, enlivens the contrast. The doctrine promulgated during the dark times of Christianity, That God is a mercenary being; and that every person, however wicked, may obtain pardon of his sins by money, made riches flow into the hands of ecclesiastics in a plentiful stream. And riches had the same effect upon the Christian clergy that they have upon all men, which is, to produce pride, sensuality, and profligacy: these again produced dissipation of money, which prompted avarice, and every invention for recruiting exhausted treasures

treasures *. Even as early as the eighth century, the Christian clergy, tempted by opulence, abandoned themselves to pleasure, without moderation; and far exceeded the laity in luxury, gluttony, and lust. When such were the pastors, what must have been the flock! Rejoice, O Scotland, over the poverty and temperance of thy pastors. During that period, the clergy could read, and, like parrots, they could mumble prayers in Latin: in every other respect, they rivalled the laity in ignorance. They were indeed more cunning than the laity; and understood their interest better, if to covet riches at the expence of probity, deserve that name. Three articles were established that made religion an easy service. First, That faith is the essence of religion, without regard to good works; and hence the necessity of being strictly orthodox, which the church only could determine. Second, Religious worship was reduced to a number of external ceremonies and forms, which, being declared sufficient for salvation, absolved Christians from every moral duty. Remark, that a priest is always the chief person in ceremonial worship. The third article, That God is a mercenary being, is mentioned above, with its necessary consequences. These articles brought about a total neglect, both in clergy and laity, not only of morality, but of every essential religious duty. In fine, there never was a religion that deviated more from just principles, than that professed by Christians during the dark ages. Persecution reached none but the sincerely pious and virtuous. What a glorious tolerating sentiment doth Arnobius (a) throw out, and what profusion of blood

* In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, many of the clergy dealt in merchandise; and, being free of taxes, engrossed all. In the Netherlands particularly, there was a great cry, that monasteries were converted into shops and warehouses, and the mansions of secular priests into tap-houses and inns.

(a) Lib. 1. *Adversus Gentes*.

would

would have been prevented, had it been adopted by all Christians !
 “ Da veniam, Rex summe, tuos persequentibus famulos : et quod
 “ tuæ benignitatis est proprium, fugientibus ignosce tui nominis
 “ et religionis cultum. Non est mirum, si ignoraris : majoris
 “ est admirationis, si sciaris *.” The following parable against
 persecution was communicated to me by Dr Franklin of Philadel-
 phia, a man who makes a great figure in the learned world : and
 who would make a still greater figure for benevolence and candour,
 were virtue in this declining age as much regarded as knowledge.
 “ And it came to pass after these things, that Abraham sat in the
 “ door of his tent, about the going down of the sun. And behold
 “ a man bent with age, coming from the way of the wilderness
 “ leaning on a staff. And Abraham arose, and met him, and
 “ said unto him, Turn in, I pray thee, and wash thy feet, and
 “ tarry all night ; and thou shalt arise early in the morning, and
 “ go on thy way. And the man said, Nay ; for I will abide un-
 “ der this tree. But Abraham pressed him greatly : so he turn-
 “ ed, and they went into the tent : and Abraham baked un-
 “ leavened bread, and they did eat. And when Abraham saw
 “ that the man blessed not God, he said unto him, Wherefore
 “ dost thou not worship the most high God, creator of heaven
 “ and earth ? And the man answered and said, I do not wor-
 “ ship thy God, neither do I call upon his name ; for I have made
 “ to myself a god, which abideth always in mine house, and pro-
 “ videth me with all things. And Abraham’s zeal was kindled
 “ against the man, and he arose, and fell upon him, and drove
 “ him forth with blows into the wilderness. And God called un-

* “ Forgive, Almighty power, the persecutors of thy servants ; and, in the pe-
 “ culiar benevolence of thy nature, pardon those men whose unhappiness it is to
 “ be strangers to thy name and worship, Ignorant as they are of thee, we cannot
 “ wonder at the impiety of their actions.”

“ to Abraham, saying, Abraham, where is the stranger ? And
 “ Abraham answered and said, Lord, he would not worship thee,
 “ neither would he call upon thy name ; therefore have I driven
 “ him out from before my face into the wilderness. And God
 “ said, Have I borne with him these hundred ninety and eight
 “ years, and nourished him, and clothed him, notwithstanding
 “ his rebellion against me ; and couldst not thou, who art thyself
 “ a sinner, bear with him one night ? ” The historical style of the
 Old Testament is here finely imitated ; and the moral must strike
 every one who is not sunk in stupidity and superstition. Were it
 really a chapter of Genesis, one is apt to think, that persecution
 could never have shown a bare face among Jews or Christians.
 But alas ! that is a vain thought. Such a passage in the Old Te-
 stament, would avail as little against the rancorous passions of men,
 as the following passages in the New Testament, tho’ persecution
 cannot be condemned in terms more explicit. “ Him that is weak
 “ in the faith, receive you, but not to doubtful disputations. For
 “ one believeth that he may eat all things : another, who is weak,
 “ eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eat-
 “ eth not ; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that
 “ eateth. Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant ? to
 “ his own master he standeth or falleth. One man esteemeth one
 “ day above another : another esteemeth every day alike. Let e-
 “ very man be fully persuaded in his own mind. But why dost
 “ thou judge thy brother ? or why dost thou set at nought thy
 “ brother ? for we shall all stand before the judgement-seat of
 “ Christ, every one to give an account of himself to God. I know,
 “ that there is nothing unclean of itself : but to him that esteem-
 “ eth any thing unclean, to him it is unclean. The kingdom of
 “ God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and
 “ joy in the Holy Ghost. Let us therefore follow after the things
 “ which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify an-
 VOL. II. 3 O “ other

“other (a).” Our Saviour himself declared against persecution in the most express terms. The Jews and Samaritans were of the same religion; but some trivial differences in the ceremonial part of worship, rendered them odious to each other. Our Saviour being refused lodging in a village of Samaria, because he was travelling to Jerusalem, his disciples James and John said, “Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?” But he rebuked them, and said, “The Son of man is not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them (b).”

It gives me real concern, that even the hot fire of persecution, did not altogether purify our Reformed clergy from that satanical spirit. No sooner were the Dissenters settled in New England, where they fled to avoid persecution, than they set on foot a persecution against the Quakers, no less furious than what they themselves had suffered at home. Nor did the Reformed clergy in Scotland lose sight of that magisterial authority, which had been assumed by their predecessors of the Romish church, on the ridiculous pretext, of being ambassadors to men from Jesus Christ. Upon a representation, ann. 1646, from the commission of the kirk of Scotland, James Bell and Colin Campbell, bailies of Glasgow, were committed to prison by the parliament, merely for having said, that kirk-men meddled too much in civil matters. Could a despotic prince have exerted a more arbitrary act? but the church was all-powerful in those days *.

* Toleration in religion, tho' obvious to common understanding, was not however the production of reason, but of commerce. The advantage of toleration for promoting commerce, was discovered long before by the Portuguese. They were too zealous Catholics to venture so bold a measure in Portugal; but it was permitted in Goa, and the inquisition in that town was confined to Roman Catholics.

(a) Epistle of Paul to the Romans, chap. 14.

(b) Luke, ix. 54.

I would do justice to every church, not excepting that of Rome ; and it is doing that church no more but justice to acknowledge, that the spirit of persecution was not more eminent in it, than zeal for making converts. The former is retiring out of the world ; and I wish it most profound rest, never again to revive. People begin to be ashamed of it, as of a garment long out of fashion. Let the other continue for amusement : it is innocent ; and if it do no good, it is not productive of so much harm.

The desire of making converts proceeds from two different causes. In superstitious zealots, it proceeds from an opinion, that all who differ from them are in the road to damnation : for which reason, there is a rage of making converts among Roman Catholics ; who, without ceremony, deliver over to the flames of hell, every person who is not of their communion. The other cause is more natural : every man thinks himself in the right, especially in matters of consequence ; and for that reason, he is happy to find others of his opinion (*a*). With respect to the first cause, I beg attention to the following considerations ; not with any hope of converting zealots, but to prevent, if possible, others from becoming such. In none of the works of God is variety more happily blended with uniformity, than in the formation of man. Uniformity prevails in the human face with respect to eyes, nose, mouth, and other capital parts : variety prevails in the expressions of these parts, serving to distinguish one person from another, without hazard of error. In like manner, the minds of men are uniform with respect to their passions and principles ; but the various tones and expressions of these, form different characters without end. A face destitute of a nose or of a mouth, is monstrous : a mind destitute of the moral sense, or of a sense of religion, is no less so. But variety of expression in different faces,

(*a*) Elements of Criticism, vol. 2. p. 493. edit. 5.

is agreeable : because we relish variety ; and a similar variety in the expressions or tones of passion, ought to be equally agreeable. Endless differences in temper, in taste, and in mental faculties, that of reason in particular, produce necessarily variety in sentiment and in opinion. Can God be displeased with such variety, when it is his own work ? He requires no uniformity except with respect to an upright mind and clear conscience, which are indispensable. Here at the same time is discovered an illustrious final cause. Different countenances in the human race, not only distinguish one person from another, but promote society, by aiding us to chuse a friend, an associate, a partner for life. Differences in opinion and sentiment, have still more beneficial effects : they rouse the attention, give exercise to the understanding, and sharpen the reasoning faculty. With respect to religion in particular, perfect uniformity, which furnisheth no subject for thinking nor for reasoning, would produce languor in divine worship, and make us sink into cold indifference. How frantic then is the rage of making profelytes ? Let every man enjoy his native liberty, of thinking as well as of acting ; free to act as he pleases, provided he obey the rules of morality ; equally free to think as he pleases, provided he obey the great God as his maker and master, and acknowledge the necessary connection of religion with morality. Strict uniformity in other matters, may be compared to a spring-day, calm and serene ; neither so hot as to make us drop a garment, nor so cold as to require an addition ; no wind to ruffle, nor rain to make shelter necessary. We enjoy the sweet scene for a moment : we walk, we sit, we muse ; — but soon fall asleep. Agitation is the element of man, and the life of society. Let us not attempt to correct the works of God : the attempt will betray us into absurd errors. This doctrine cannot be better illustrated than by a conversation, reported by the Jesuit Tachard, between the King of Siam, and a French ambassador, who, in his master's name,

name, urged that king to embrace the Christian religion. “I am surpris’d,” said his Majesty of Siam, “that the King of France, my good friend, should interest himself so warmly in what concerns God only. He hath given to his creatures different minds and different inclinations, which naturally lead them to differ in opinion. We admire variety in the material world: why not equally admire it in matters of religion? Have we not then reason to believe, that God takes pleasure in all the different forms of worship? Had it been the intention of God to produce uniformity in religion, he would have formed all men with the same mind.” Bernier introduces some Gentiles of Hindostan defending their religion much in the same manner: “That they did not pretend their law to be universal; that they did not hold ours to be false, as, for ought they knew, it might be a good law for us; and that God probably made many roads to heaven.”

With respect to the other cause above mentioned, viz. the desire of putting people in the right road. To reason others into our religious principles, is natural; but it is not always prudent. I wish my neighbour to be of my opinion, because I think my opinion right: but is there no danger of undermining his religious principles, without establishing better in their stead? Ought I not to restrain my desire of making converts, when the attempt may possibly reduce them to abandon religion altogether, as a matter of utter uncertainty? If a man of clear understanding has by some unhappy means been led into error, that man may be set right by fair reasoning: but beware of endeavouring to convert people of low parts, who are indebted for their creed to parents, to education, or to example: it is safer to let them rest as they are.

At any rate, let us never attempt to gain profelytes by rewards nor by terror: what other effect can such motives produce, but dissimulation

diffimulation and lying, parents of every secret crime. The Empress of Russia uses a method for converting her Pagan subjects of Kamiskatka, no less agreeable than effectual; which is, to exempt from taxes for ten years, such of them as profess the Christian religion. This practice may be political; but it tends not to advance religion, and is destructive of morality. Terror, on the other hand, may be equally effectual, but is not altogether so agreeable. The people of Rum, one of the Hebrides, were Papists till the beginning of the present century, when in one day they were all proselyted to the Protestant faith. Maclean of Coll, their chieftain, went to the island with a Protestant minister, and ordered all the inhabitants to appear on Sunday at public worship. They came, but refused to hear a Protestant minister. The chieftain reasoned with them: but finding that his reasonings made no impression, he laid hold of the most forward; and having made a deep impression on him with his cane, push'd him into the church. The rest followed like meek lambs; and from that day have continued firm Protestants. The Protestantism of Rum is styled by their Popish neighbours, the faith of the *yellow stick*.

To apply rewards, terror, or any other means, for making proselytes, except fair reasoning, appears to me a strange perversion. Can God be pleased with such means, or can any rational man justify them? What then should move any one to put them in practice? I should be utterly at a loss to answer the question, but for a fact mentioned more than once above, that the rude and illiterate, judge by sight only, and not by reflection, which makes them lay weight on the external visible act, without thinking of intention, because it is not visible. In truth, the bulk of mankind rest upon the external profession of religion: they never dip into the heart, nor consider how that stands affected. What else is it but the external act merely, that moves the Romish missionaries to baptize the infants of savages even at the moment of expiring?

expiring? which they prosecute with much pious ardour. Their zeal merits applause, but by no means their judgement. Can any rational person seriously believe, that the dipping a savage or an infant in water, will make either of them a Christian, or that the want of this ceremony will precipitate them into hell? The Lithuanians, before their conversion to Christianity, worshipped serpents, every family entertaining one as a household god. Sigismundus, in his commentaries of Muscovy, reports the following incident. A converted Christian having persuaded a neighbour to follow his example, and in token of his conversion to kill his serpent, was surprised at his next visit, to find his convert in the deepest melancholy, bitterly lamenting that he had murdered his god, and that the most dreadful calamities would befall him. Was this person a Christian more than nominally? At the end of the last century when Kempfer was in Japan, there remained but about fifty Japan Christians, who were locked up in prison for life. These poor people knew no more of the Christian religion, but the names only of our Saviour and of the Virgin Mary; and yet so zealous Christians were they, as rather to die miserably in jail, than to renounce the name of Christ, and be set at liberty.

I cannot with satisfaction conclude this sketch, without congratulating my present countrymen of Britain, upon their knowledge of the intimate connection that true religion has with morality. May the importance of that connection, always at heart, excite us to govern every action of our lives by the united principles of morality and religion:—what a happy people would we be!

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF
HIS MOST EXCELLENT
MAYESTY
JAMES THE SECOND

BY
JOHN BURNET
OF THE SOCIETY OF THE
SACRED THEOLOGY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD

PRINTED BY
J. BARNARD
AT THE PRESS OF
J. BARNARD
IN THE CITY OF LONDON

M
The History of the
Reign of James the
Second, by John Burnet,
of the Society of the
Sacred Theology in the
University of Oxford.
Printed by J. Barnard,
at the Press of J. Barnard,
in the City of London.

Vol. II
1704

A P P E N D I X.

Sketches concerning S C O T L A N D.

S K E T C H I.

SCOTCH ENTAILS considered in Moral and Political views.

MAN is by nature a hoarding animal; and to secure to men what they acquire by honest industry, the sense of property is made a branch of human nature (a). During the infancy of nations, when artificial wants are unknown, the hoarding appetite makes no figure. The use of money produced a great change in the human heart. Money having at command the goods of fortune, introduced inequality of rank, luxury, and artificial wants without end. No bounds are set to hoarding, where an appetite for artificial wants is indulged: love of money becomes the ruling passion: it is coveted by many in order to

(a) Book 1. sketch 3.

be hoarded; and means are absurdly converted into an end. The sense of property, weak among savages, ripens gradually till it arrives at maturity in polished nations. In every stage of the progress, some new power is added to property; and now for centuries, men have enjoy'd every power over their own goods, that a rational mind can desire (*b*): they have the free disposal during life; and even after death, by naming an heir. These powers are sufficient for accomplishing every rational purpose: they are sufficient for commerce, and they are sufficient for benevolence. But the artificial wants of men are boundless: not content with the full enjoyment of their property during life, nor with the prospect of its being enjoy'd by a favourite heir, they are anxiously bent to preserve it to themselves for ever. A man who has amassed a great estate in land, is miserable at the prospect of being obliged to quit his hold: to sooth his diseased fancy, he makes a deed securing it for ever to certain heirs; who must without end bear his name, and preserve his estate entire. Death, it is true, must at last separate him from his idol: it is some consolation, however, that his will governs and gives law to every subsequent proprietor. How repugnant to the frail state of man, are such swollen conceptions! Upon these however are founded entails, which have prevailed in many parts of the world, and unhappily at this day infest Scotland. Did entails produce no other harm but the gratification of a distempered appetite for property, they might be endured, though far from deserving approbation: but, like other transgressions of nature and reason, they are productive of much mischief, not only to commerce, but to the very heirs for whose benefit it is pretended that they are made.

Considering that the law of nature has bestow'd on man, every

(a) Historical Law-tracts, tract 3.

power of property that is necessary either for commerce or for benevolence, how blind was it in the English legislature to add a most irrational power, that of making an entail! But men will always be mending; and when a lawgiver ventures to tamper with the laws of nature, he hazards much mischief. We have a pregnant instance above, of an attempt to mend the laws of God, in many absurd regulations for the poor; and that the law authorising entails, is another instance of the same kind, will be evident from what follows.

The mischievous effects of English entails were soon discovered: they occasioned such injustice and oppression, that even the judges ventured to relieve the nation from them, by an artificial form, termed *fine and recovery*. And yet, though no moderate man would desire more power over his estate than he has by common law, the legislature of Scotland enabled every land-proprietor to fetter his estate for ever; to tyrannize over his heirs; and to reduce their property to a shadow, by prohibiting alienation; and by prohibiting the contracting debt, were it even to redeem the proprietor from death or slavery. Thus many a man, fonder of his estate than of his wife and children, grudges the use of it to his natural heirs, reducing them to the state of mere liferenters. Behold the consequences. A number of noblemen and gentlemen among us, lie in wait for every parcel of land that comes to market. Intent upon aggrandizing their family, or rather their estate, which is the favourite object, they secure every purchase by an entail; and the same course will be followed, till no land be left to be purchased. Thus every entailed estate in Scotland becomes in effect a mortmain, admitting additions without end, but absolutely barring any alienation; and if the legislature interpose not, the period is not distant, when all the land in Scotland will be locked up by entails, and withdrawn from commerce.

The purpose of the present essay, is to set before our legislature, coolly and impartially, the destructive effects of a Scotch entail. I am not so sanguine as to hope, that men, who convert means into an end, and avariciously covet land for its own sake, will be prevailed upon to regard, either the interest of their country or of their posterity : but I would gladly hope, that the legislature may be roused to give attention to a national object of no slight importance.

I begin with effects of a private or domestic nature. To the possessor, an entail is a constant source of discontent, by subverting that liberty and independence, which all men covet, with respect to their goods as well as their persons. What can be more vexatious to a proprietor of a great land-estate, than to be barred from the most laudable acts, suitable provisions for example to a wife or children ? not to mention numberless acts of benevolence, that endear individuals to each other, and make society comfortable. Were he ever so industrious, his fields must lie waste ; for what man will lay out his own money upon an estate that is not his own ? A great proportion of the land in Scotland is in such a state, that by laying out a thousand pounds or so, an intelligent proprietor may add a hundred pounds yearly to his rent-roll. But an entail effectually bars that improvement : it affords the proprietor no credit ; and supposing him to have the command of money independent of the estate, he will be ill-fated if he have not means to employ it more profitably for his own interest. An entail, at the same time, is no better than a trap for an improvident possessor : to avoid altogether the contracting debt, is impracticable ; and if a young man be guided more by pleasure than by prudence, which commonly is the case of young men ; a vigilant and rapacious substitute, taking advantage of a forfeiting clause, turns him out of possession, and delivers him over to want and misery.

But

But an entail is productive of consequences still more dismal, even with respect to heirs. A young man upon whom the family-estate is entailed, without any power reserved to the father, is not commonly obsequious to advice, nor patiently submissive to the fatigues of education: he abandons himself to pleasure, and indulges his passions without control. In one word, there is no situation more subversive of morals, than that of a young man, bred up from infancy in the certainty of inheriting an opulent fortune.

The condition of the other children, daughters especially, is commonly deplorable. The proprietor of a large entailed estate, leaves at his death children who have acquired a taste for sumptuous living. The sons drop off one by one, and a number of daughters remain, with a scanty provision, or perhaps with none at all. A collateral male heir succeeds, who after a painful search is discovered in some remote corner, qualified to procure bread by the spade or the plough, but entirely unqualified for behaving as master of an opulent fortune. By such a metamorphosis, the poor man makes a ludicrous figure; while the daughters, reduced to indigence, are in a situation much more lamentable than are the brats of beggars.

Our entails produce another domestic evil, for which no proper remedy is provided. The sums permitted in most entails to younger children, however adequate when the entail is made, become in time too scanty, by a fall in the value of money, and by increase of luxury; which is peculiarly hard upon daughters of great families: the provisions destined for them will not afford them bread; and they cannot hope to be suitably matched, without a decent fortune. If we adhere to entails, nunneries ought to be provided.

But the domestic evils of an entail make no figure, compared with those that respect the public. These, in their full extent would

would fill a volume: they are well known; and it may be sufficient to keep them in view by some general hints.

As observed above, few tenants in tail can command money for improvements, however profitable. Such discouragement to agriculture, hurtful to proprietors of entailed estates, is still more so to the public. It is now an established maxim, That a state is powerful in proportion to the product of its land: a nation that feeds its neighbours, can starve them. The quantity of land that is locked up in Scotland by entails, has damped the growing spirit of agriculture. There is not produced sufficiency of corn at home for our own consumpt: and our condition will become worse and worse by new entails, till agriculture and industry be annihilated. Were the great entailed estates in Scotland, split into small properties of fifty or a hundred pounds yearly rent, we should soon be enabled, not only to supply our own markets, but to spare for our neighbours.

In the next place, our entails are no less subversive of commerce than of agriculture. There are numberless land-estates in Scotland of one, two, or three hundred pounds yearly rent. Such an estate cannot afford bare necessities to the proprietor, if he pretend to live like a gentleman. But he has an excellent resource: let him apply to any branch of trade, his estate will afford him credit for what money he wants. The profit he makes, pays the interest of the money borrowed, with a surplus; and this surplus, added to the rent of his estate, enables him to live comfortably. A number of land-proprietors in such circumstances, would advance commerce to a great height. But alas! there are not many who have that resource: such is the itch in Scotland for entailing, as even to descend lower than one hundred pounds yearly. Can one behold with patience, the countenance that is given to selfish wrong-headed people, acting in direct opposition to the prosperity of their country? Commerce is no less hurt in another respect:

when

when our land is withdrawn from commerce by entails, every prosperous trader will desert a country where he can find no land to purchase; for to raise a family by acquiring an estate in land, is the ultimate aim of every merchant, and of every man who accumulates money.

Thirdly, An entail is a bitter enemy to population. Population is generally proportioned to the number of land-proprietors. A very small portion of land, managed with skill and industry, affords bread to a numerous family; and the great aim of the frugal proprietor, is to provide a fund for educating his children, and for establishing them in business. A numerous issue, at the same time, is commonly the lot of the temperate and frugal; because they are strangers to luxury and voluptuousness, which enervate the body, and dry up the sources of procreation. This is no chimaera or fond imagination: traverse Europe; compare great capitals with distant provinces; and it will be found to hold universally, that children abound much more among the industrious poor, than among the luxurious rich. But if division of land into small properties, tend to population; depopulation must be the necessary consequence of an entail, the avowed intent of which is to unite many small properties in one great estate; and consequently, to reduce land-proprietors to a small number.

Let us, in the fourth place, take under consideration, the children of landholders with respect to education and industry; for unless men be usefully employ'd, population is of no real advantage to a state. In that respect, great and small estates admit no comparison. Children of great families, accustomed to affluence and luxury, are too proud for business; and were they even willing, are incapable to drudge at a laborious employment. At the same time, as the father's hands are tied up by his entail from affording them means to subsist as persons of rank, they become a burden on the family, and on the state, and can do no service to either,

either, but by dying. Yet there are men so blind, or so callous, as to be fond of entails. Let us try whether a more pleasing scene will have any effect upon them. Children of small landholders, are from infancy educated in a frugal manner; and they must be industrious, as they depend on industry for bread. Among that class of men, education has its most powerful influence; and upon that class a nation chiefly relies, for its skilful artists and manufacturers, for its lawyers, physicians, divines, and even for its generals and statesmen.

And this leads to consider, in the fifth place, the influence that great and small estates have on manners. Gentlemen of a moderate fortune, connected with their superiors and inferiors, improve society, by spreading kindly affection through the whole members of the state. In such only resides the genuine spirit of liberty, abhorrent equally of servility to superiors and of tyranny to inferiors. The nature of the British government, creates a mutual dependence of the great and small on each other. The great have favours to bestow: the small have many more, by their privilege of electing parliament-men; which obliges men of high rank to affect popularity, if they have none at heart. This connection produces good manners at least between different ranks, and perhaps some degree of cordiality. Accumulation of land into great estates, produces opposite manners: when all the land in Scotland is swallow'd up by a number of grandees, and few gentlemen of the middle rank are left; even the appearance of popularity will vanish, leaving pride and insolence on the one hand, and abject servility on the other. In a word, the distribution of land into many shares, accords charmingly with the free spirit of the British constitution; but nothing is more repugnant to that spirit, than overgrown estates in land.

In the sixth place, Arts and sciences can never flourish in a country, where all the land is engrossed by a few men. Science
will

will never be cultivated by the dispirited tenant, who can scarce procure bread ; and still less, if possible, by the insolent landlord, who is too self-sufficient for instruction. There will be no encouragement for arts : great and opulent proprietors, fostering ambitious views, will cling to the seat of government, which is far removed from Scotland ; and if vanity make them sometimes display their grandeur at their country-seats, they will be too delicate for any articles of luxury but what are foreign. The arts and sciences being thus banished, Scotland will be deserted by every man of spirit who can find bread elsewhere.

In the seventh place, Such overgrown estates will produce an irregular and dangerous influence with respect to the House of Commons. The parliament-boroughs will be subdued by weight of money ; and with respect to county-elections, it is a chance if there be left in a county as many landholders capable to elect, and to be elected, as even to afford a choice. In such circumstances, will our constitution be in no danger, from the ambitious views of men elevated above others by their vast possessions ? Is it unlikely, that such men, taking advantage of public discord, will become an united body of ambitious oppressors, overawing their sovereign as well as their fellow-subjects ? Such was the miserable condition of Britain, while the feudal oligarchy subsisted : such at present is the miserable condition of Poland : and such will be the miserable condition of Scotland, if the legislature afford not a remedy.

If the public interest only were to be regarded, the axe ought to be applied, cutting down entails to the very root : but a numberless body of substitutes are interested, many of whom would be disinherited, if the tenants in tail had power. To reconcile as much as possible these opposite interests, it is proposed, that the following articles be authorised by a statute. First, That the act of parliament 1685 be repealed with respect to all future operations.

tions. Second, That entails already made and completed, shall continue effectual to such substitutes as exist at the date of the act proposed; but shall not benefit any substitute born after it. Third, That power be reserved to every proprietor, after the act 1685 is at an end, to settle his estate upon what heirs he thinks proper, and to bar these heirs from altering the order of succession; these powers being inherent in property at common law.

At the same time, the prohibiting entails will avail little, if trust-deeds be permitted in their utmost extent, as in England. And therefore, in order to re-establish the law of nature with respect to land-property, a limitation of trust-deeds is necessary. My proposal is, That no trust-deed, directing or limiting the succession of heirs to a land-estate, shall be effectual beyond the life of the heirs in existence at the time.

SKETCH

S K E T C H II.

Government of ROYAL BOROUGHS in Scotland.

BY a royal borough is in Scotland understood an incorporation that hold their lands of the crown, and are governed by magistrates of their own naming. The administration of the annual revenues of a royal borough, termed the *common good*, is trusted to the magistrates; but not without control. It was originally subjected to the review of the Great Chamberlain; and accordingly the chap. 39. § 45. of the *Iter Camerarii*, contains the following articles, recommended to the Chamberlain to be enquired into. “ Giff there be an good assedation and uptaking of the
 “ common good of the burgh, and giff faithful compt be made
 “ thereof to the community of the burgh; and giff no compt is
 “ made, he whom and in quhaes hands it is come, and how it
 “ passës by the community.” In pursuance of these instructions, the Chamberlain’s precept for holding the ayr, or circuit, is directed to the provost and bailies, enjoining them, “ to call all those
 “ who have received any of the town’s revenues, or used any of-
 “ fice within the burgh, since the last chamberlain-ayr, to an-
 “ swer such things as shall be laid to their charge.” *Iter Camer. cap. 1.* And in the third chapter, which contains the forms of the chamberlain-ayr, the first thing to be done after fencing the court, is, to call the bailies and serjeants to be challenged and accused from the time of the last ayr.

This office, dangerous by excess of power, being suppressed, the royal boroughs were left in a state of anarchy. The magistracy, being now no longer under any check or control, was coveted by noblemen and gentlemen in the neighbourhood; who, under the name of office-bearers, laid their hands on the revenues of the borough, and converted all to their own profit. This corruption was heavily complained of in the reign of James V.; and a remedy was provided by act 26. parl. 1535, enacting, 1st, That none be qualified to be provost, bailie, or alderman, but an indwelling burghers. 2dly, "That no inhabitant purchase lordship out of burgh, to the terror of his comburgeses. And, 3dly, That all provosts, bailies, and aldermen of boroughs, bring yearly to the chequer at a day certain, the compt-books of their common good, to be seen and considered by the Lords Auditors, giff the same be spended for the common well of the burgh, or not, under the penalty of losing their freedom. And that the saids provosts, bailies, and aldermen, warn yearly, fifteen days before their coming to the chequer, all those who are willing to come for examining the said accounts, that they may impugn the same, in order that all murmur may cease in that behalf." And to enforce these regulations, a brieve was issued from the chancery, commanding the magistrates to present their accounts to the exchequer, and summoning the burgeses to appear and object to the same.

A defect in this statute made it less effectual than it was intended to be. Magistrates, to avoid the penalty, brought the count-books of their common good to the exchequer; but they brought no rental of the common good to found a charge against them. This defect was remedied by act 28. parl. 1693, containing the following preamble. "That the royal boroughs, by the male-administration of their magistrates, have fallen under great debts and burdens, to the diminution of their dignity, and the disabling

“ abling of them to serve the crown and government as they
“ ought; and that the care, oversight, and control of the com-
“ mon good of boroughs, belong to their Majesties by virtue of
“ their prerogative-royal; therefore, for preventing the like abuses
“ and misapplications in all time thereafter, their Majesties sta-
“ tute and ordain, That every burgh-royal, shall, betwixt and
“ the first of November next, bring to the Lords of Treasury and
“ Exchequer, an exact account of charge and discharge, subscri-
“ bed by the magistrates and town-clerk, of their whole public-
“ good and revenues, and of the whole debts and incumbrances
“ that affect the same.” This completed the remedy, by putting
means into the hands of the Barons of Exchequer, to control
the accounts enjoined by the former statute to be yearly given in.

The foregoing regulations are kept in observance. Every year
a precept issues from the exchequer, signed by one of the Barons,
addressed to the director of the chancery, requiring him to make
out a brieve for every royal borough. The brieve is accordingly
made out, returned to the exchequer, and sent to the several
sheriffs, to be served in all the royal boroughs within their
bounds, as directed by the statute. These brieves are according-
ly so served by the sheriffs; and particularly it is a constant form
in most of the royal boroughs, to issue a proclamation, fifteen days
before the day named for appearance in exchequer, warning the
inhabitants to repair there, in order to object to the public ac-
counts of the town: and further, in order to give them opportu-
nity to frame objections, the book and counts are laid open for
these fifteen days, to be inspected by all the inhabitants.

We learn from the records of exchequer, that from the year
1660 to the year 1683, accounts were regularly given in to ex-
chequer, in obedience to the statute. The town of Edinburgh
only having failed for some short time, Captain Thomas Hamil-
ton merchant there, by an action in exchequer, compelled the
magistrates

magistrates to produce upon oath their treasurer's accounts, which were accordingly audited. And we also learn, that from the Restoration down to the Union, a clerk to the borough-roll was appointed by the crown, whose proper business it was to examine and audite the accounts of the boroughs.

Notwithstanding the foregoing salutary regulations, and the form constantly practised to make them effectual, the boroughs of late years have forborn to present their accounts in exchequer; hoping that they would be overlooked by the English court of exchequer, established in Scotland after the Union; which accordingly happened. This neglect in the court of exchequer is greatly to be regretted, because it reduces the royal boroughs, by the male-administration of their magistrates, to the same miserable condition that is so loudly complained of in the statutes above mentioned. It is undoubtedly in the power of the Barons to restore good government to the boroughs, by compelling the magistrates to account yearly in the court of exchequer, according to the foregoing regulations. And to that end no more is necessary, but to signify publicly that they are resolved hereafter to put these regulations in execution.

How beneficial that step would be to this country in general, and to the royal boroughs in particular, will appear from considering, first, the unhappy consequences that result from suffering magistrates to dispose of the town's revenues, without any check or control; and next the good effects that must result from a regular and careful management, under the inspection of the King's judges.

The unhappy consequences of leaving magistrates without any check or control, are too visible to be disguised. The revenues of a royal borough are seldom laid out for the good of the town, but in making friends to the knot who are in possession of the magistracy; and in rioting and drunkenness, for which every pre-

text

text is laid hold of, particularly that of hospitality to strangers. Such mismanagement tends to idleness, and corruption of manners; which accordingly are remarkable in most royal boroughs. Nor is the contagion confined within the town: it commonly spreads all around.

Another consequence, no less fatal, of leaving magistrates to act without control, is a strong desire in every licentious burgher, of stepping into the magistracy, for his own sake, and for that of his friends. Hence the factions and animosities that prevail in almost all the royal boroughs; which are violently and indecently pursued, without the least regard to the good of the community.

The greatest evil of all, respects the choice of their representatives in parliament. A habit of riot and intemperance, makes them fit subjects to be corrupted, by every adventurer who is willing to lay out money for purchasing a seat in parliament. Hence the infamous practice of bribery at elections, which tends not only to corrupt the whole mass of the people, but, which is still more dreadful, tends to fill the House of Commons with men of dissolute manners, void of probity and honour.

But turning from scenes so dismal, let us view the beautiful effects that result, from an administration regularly carried on, as directed by the statutes above mentioned. The revenues of the royal boroughs are supposed to be above L. 40,000 yearly. And were this sum, or the half of it, prudently expended, for promoting arts and industry among the numerous inhabitants of royal boroughs, the benefit, in a country so narrow and poor as Scotland, would be immense: it would tend to population, it would greatly increase industry, manufactures, and commerce, beside augmenting the public revenue. In the next place, as there would be no temptation for designing men to convert the burden of magistracy into a benefit, faction and discord would vanish; and there would be no less solicitude to shun the burden, than at present

present is seen to obtain it. None would submit to the burden but the truly patriotic, men who would cheerfully bestow their time, and perhaps their money, upon the public; and whose ambition it would be to acquire a character, by promoting industry, temperance, and honesty, among their fellow-citizens.

And when the government of the royal boroughs comes to be in so good hands, bribery, which corrupts the very vitals of our constitution, will be banished of course. And considering the proper and constitutional dependence of the royal boroughs upon the king's judges, we may have reasonable assurance, that few representatives will be chosen, but who are friends to their country and to their sovereign.

S K E T C H

S K E T C H I I I .

Plan for improving and preserving in order the
H I G H W A Y S in Scotland.

P R E F A C E .

*H*ighways have in Scotland become a capital object of police, by the increase of inland commerce, upon which bad roads are a heavy tax. Happily for our country, no person is ignorant of this truth; and we see with pleasure the fruits of their conviction in various attempts, public and private, to establish this valuable branch of police upon the best footing. As this will be found no easy task, it may reasonably be hoped, that men of genius will seriously apply themselves to it, and in general that every person will freely produce such hints as occur to them. In the latter view the following plan is offered to the public: and if, from the various proposals that have been or shall be published, an effective plan can be framed, such as completely to answer its purpose, it may safely be pronounced, that it will produce more benefit to this country, than has been produced by any other single improvement since the union of the two kingdoms.

1. **T**HE justices of peace, commissioners of supply, the sheriff or steward depute, and the first magistrate of royal boroughs, shall be commissioners for making and repairing highways, bridges, and ferries, in the several shires and stewartries. All the powers given by law to the justices of peace, and commissioners of supply, with respect to highways, bridges, and ferries, shall be transferred to them; and any two shall be a quorum, except where a greater number is required by this act.

2. The sheriff or steward depute shall appoint the first day of meeting of the said commissioners, as soon as may conveniently be after the date of the act, by an intimation at each parish-church upon a Sunday at the close of the forenoon-service. And the last Tuesday of March shall yearly thereafter be a day of meeting at the head borough of the shire or stewartry, in place of the first or third Tuesday of May appointed by former acts. The commissioners shall appoint a preses, convener, and clerk: and they shall be empowered to adjourn themselves from time to time.

3. The commissioners, at their first meeting, shall set about a division of the shire or stewartry into two or more districts, as they see convenient. And if they cannot overtake this work at that meeting, they shall appoint proper persons to form a plan of the intended divisions, which plan shall be reported to the commissioners at their next meeting, in order to be approved or altered by them. This being settled, the commissioners shall appoint the heritors in these several districts, or any three of them, to meet on a certain day and place, to make lists of the whole public roads within their respective districts, and to settle the order of reparation, beginning with those that are the most frequented. The proceedings of these district-meetings must be reported to the commissioners, at their next meeting; who are empowered to settle the order of reparation, in case of variance among the heritors;

tors ; and also to add any road that may have been omitted. And they shall record a scheme or plan of the whole roads in the shire, thus enlisted, with their resolutions thereupon, to be seen in the clerk's hands *gratis*. But upon any just cause appearing in the course of administration, the commissioners shall be empowered to alter or vary this plan, provided it be at a meeting previously appointed for that purpose, and where three fifths at least of the commissioners are present.

4. If the sheriff or steward neglect to appoint the first meeting of the commissioners, he shall incur a penalty of L. 100, upon a summary complaint to the court of session by any one heritor of the shire ; with costs of suit, the one half to the plaintiff, and the other half to be applied by the commissioners for the purposes of this act. If the commissioners fail to meet at the day appointed by the sheriff or steward, or fail to divide the shire or stewartry into districts, within six months of their first meeting, the sheriff or steward depute, under the foresaid penalty, shall be bound to do that work himself ; and also to appoint the heritors in the several districts, or any three of them, to make lists of the public roads as above mentioned, and to report their resolutions to him ; and he is empowered to settle the order of reparation, in case of variance among the heritors. If the heritors fail to meet, and to make a list of the roads as aforesaid, this work shall be performed by the sheriff or steward depute himself. And he shall be indemnified of whatever expences he is at in prosecuting the said work, out of the sums that are to be levied by authority of this act, in manner after mentioned, with an additional sum for his own trouble, to be named by the circuit-judges.

5. No person shall act as a commissioner upon this statute, but who has an estate within the county of L. 200 Scots valuation, or is heir-presumptive to such an estate, or is named a commissioner *virtute officii*, under the penalty of L. 20 Sterling *toties quoties*, to

be prosecuted before any competent court, by a popular action, with costs of suit; the one half to the plaintiff, the other half to the purposes of this act.

6. Whereas the sum of 10 d. directed by the act 1669 to be imposed upon each L. 100 of valued rent, is insufficient for the purposes therein expressed; and whereas the six days statute-work for repairing the highways is in many respects inconvenient; therefore instead of the 10 d. and instead of the statute-work, the commissioners, together with the heritors possessed of L. 200 Scots of valued rent, five, whether commissioners or heritors, making a quorum, shall annually, upon the said last Tuesday of March, assess each heritor in a sum not exceeding upon each L. 100 valued rent; the assessment imposed on the heritors to be levied by the collector of supply, along with the cess, and by the same legal remedies. The heritors are entitled to relieve themselves of the one half of the said assessment, by laying the same upon their tenants, in proportion to their rents; an heritor being always considered as a tenant of the land he has in his natural possession.

7. With respect to boroughs of royalty, regality, and barony, and large trading villages, the commissioners are empowered to levy from each householder, a sum not exceeding 2 s. yearly, more or less in proportion to the assessment of the shire, to be paid within forty days after notice given, under the penalty of double, besides expence of process. Provided, that any of these householders who have country-farms, by which they contribute to relieve their landlords as above mentioned, shall be exempted from this part of the assessment.

8. If the commissioners and heritors neglect to assess their shire, or name so small a sum as to be an elusory assessment, insufficient to answer the purposes of this act, the court of justiciary, or the circuit-judges, are in that case empowered and required to lay on the
the

the highest assessment that is made lawful by this act. In case of a total omission, the commissioners and heritors who, by neglecting to convene without a good cause of absence, have occasioned the said omission, shall be subjected each of them to a penalty of L. 20 Sterling. And to make these penalties effectual, the trustees for fisheries and manufactures are appointed to sue for the same before the court of session, and to apply the same, when recovered, to any useful purpose within the shire, especially to the purposes of this act. And to preserve the said fines entire for the public service, the trustees shall be entitled to costs of suit.

9. The sums levied as aforesaid shall be laid out annually upon the highways, bridges, and ferries, for making, repairing, or improving the same; proceeding regularly with the reparation according to the scheme or plan ordered as above to be settled in each shire and stewartry.

10. With respect to roads that are not the first in order, and for which there is no interim provision by this act during reparation of the more frequented roads, the commissioners are empowered to exact from cottars and day-labourers their statute-work according to the acts presently in force, to be applied to those secondary roads. The statute-work is not to be demanded unless for this purpose; and is to cease totally after the highways have, by means of the present act, been once totally repaired.

11. The commissioners and heritors, at all their meetings, shall bear their own charges.

12. The clause in the act 1661, empowering heritors, at the sight of the sheriff, to cast about highways for their convenience, shall be repealed; and it shall be declared unlawful, in time coming, to turn about or change any highway, unless for the benefit of the public, as by shortening it, carrying it through firmer ground, or making it more level; and to that purpose the commissioners

missioners shall be impowered to turn about highways, as also to widen the same, not exceeding thirty feet, free of ditches. But the commissioners shall have no power to carry a road through any house, garden, orchard, or pleasure-ground.

13. The commissioners shall have power to take from the adjacent lands, stones, sand, gravel, or other materials for making the highways, paying always for the damage done.

14. With respect to high-roads which bound the properties of neighbouring heritors, and which it may be found necessary to alter or widen, the commissioners shall be empowered to adjudge to one heritor any small bits of ground cut off from the other by the road so altered; and if land cannot be given for land, to make a compensation in money, valuing the land at the current price of the country.

15. In order to prevent water stagnating on the highways, the commissioners shall be impowered to make ditches or drains through neighbouring grounds; and such ditches or drains shall be preserved entire by the proprietors of the land, or at their charges.

16. As the foresaid assessment, after repairing the highways, may not be sufficient for building bridges, or making ferries, where rivers are large; any five of the commissioners may, for building bridges, or making ferries, establish a pontage or toll; so much for horses, so much for horned cattle, and so much for sheep, and the double for each beast in a wheel-carriage. Upon the credit of the toll, the said commissioners may borrow money, to be employed wholly upon the bridge or ferry where the toll is gathered. But before borrowing the money, an estimate must be made of the expence of the work. After the work is finished, the sum bestowed on it must be ascertained: an accurate account must be kept of the gradual payment of this sum by the toll; and when
it

it is completely paid, the commissioners must declare the bridge or ferry to be free.

17. The determinations of the commissioners shall be final, unless complained of in manner following.

18. If any heritor apprehend that undue preference is given to a certain highway, or conceive himself aggrieved by any order or sentence of the commissioners, it shall be lawful for him, within forty days of the act complained of, to enter a complaint in the court of session; and the judgement upon such complaint shall be final. But such complaint shall only be effectual for damages, and shall not stay execution of the work. At the same time, no complaint shall be admitted till security be given to pay full costs, in case the plaintiff be found in the wrong.

19. Former laws concerning highways, bridges, or ferries, to continue in force, unless as far as altered by this act.

20. An annual state of what is done by virtue of this act, made up by the commissioners, or their clerk, shall, before the last Tuesday of March, be laid before the trustees for fisheries and manufactures, in order to be made a part of their annual report to the King; and these trustees shall direct proper persons to inspect what work is done upon the high-roads, and in what manner. Upon any misapplication or embezzlement of the money levied, any neglect in levying, or any wrong done to the public, contrary to the intention of this act, the trustees are required to set on foot and prosecute what redress is competent in law or equity, provided the prosecution be commenced within a year after the offence.

Query, Ought not broad wheels to be required?

CONSIDERATIONS on the preceding PLAN.

THE laws in Scotland relating to this branch of public police, are numerous ; some enacted while Scotland was a separate kingdom, some after its union with England. It is not the purpose of this paper to enter into a detail of the various regulations established by these laws : they are generally known ; and in the late abridgement of our statute-law, they are all recapitulated with brevity and precision. It shall suffice cursorily to observe, that the acts made during the reign of Charles II. form the groundwork of our regulations concerning highways : the later acts are little more than explanatory of the former.

It seems to have been the plan of the legislature, that highways should be repaired by those who are employed in husbandry ; and accordingly, the six days annual labour is, in the statutes of Charles II. imposed upon them only.

This was a measure not ill suited to the state of Scotland at that period. During the last century, we had little inland commerce to require good roads, except that of corn carried to market ; and for that reason, it was natural to impose upon husbandmen the burden of repairing highways. These persons, at the same time, passing the whole summer in idleness, unless when called to perform personal services to capricious and unfeeling landlords, could not think it a hardship to have some part of their time employed in serving themselves instead of their landlords.

That annual labour upon highways, limited to a few days, should be required from men in that condition, appears not unjust. And why may we not suppose the legislature at that time capable

capable of such enlarged views, as to prefer this method for repairing highways, in order to bring on gradually a habit of labour and industry? But the condition of Scotland at present differs widely from what it was in the reign of Charles II.; and the regulations for repairing highways which were then proper, have, by alteration of circumstances, become both unjust and inexpedient.

Unjust they have become in a high degree. Inland commerce, which begins to flourish in Scotland, is greatly promoted by good roads; and every dealer, and indeed every traveller, profits by them. But no men are less interested in good roads than day-labourers, or those who are commonly called *cottars*; and yet these chiefly are burdened with the reparation. Such men, at the same time having commonly many children, find it difficult to support their families, even with their utmost industry. Nothing can be more unjust, than to impose upon such men an annual tax of six days labour for repairing roads, the goodness of which contributes little or nothing to their convenience.

Our present laws are inexpedient, as well as unjust. In the first place, a tax of this nature discourages the propagation of children, in which the strength of a state consists: the poor labourer ought to be encouraged with a reward, instead of being discouraged with a tax. In the next place, *cottars* called out to perform the statute-work, obey with reluctance, and trifle away time without doing any thing effectual. To enforce the law, and to compel such men to labour, is grievous to the gentlemen who are empowered to execute the law: they cannot punish with rigour or firmness, men who have so good reason to decline the service: they are soon disgusted with being taskmasters, and the generality desist altogether.

Laws concerning private property are always kept in observance, and they execute themselves, as is commonly expressed,

because there are always a multitude of individuals strongly interested to have them executed. But in making public laws, the great difficulty has ever been, to lay down effectual measures for putting them in execution; and by what means to make such laws execute themselves, is one of the most intricate problems in politics. Our laws concerning highways, are eminently defective in that respect: and accordingly, tho' most of them have existed near a century, they never have at any period been executed to any extent. Take the following specimen, among many that may be urged, of this defect. Overseers are forc'd into the service under a penalty, in order to compel the peasants to perform faithfully their six-days labour. To hope any good from a reluctant overseer set over a set of reluctant labourers, is a fond conceit: it is much if his resentment tempt him not to encourage their idleness. In vain would we expect, that any overseer, without a suitable reward, will exert himself in promoting the work.

To remedy the hardship of laying the burden of reparation upon those who are least able and least benefited, and at the same time to make this remedy effectual, is the purpose of the foregoing plan. And upon considering the matter in its different views, the only method that promises success, appears to be a county-tax laid upon land according to the valuation, and a capitation-tax on the inhabitants of boroughs. These taxes relieve the labouring poor, and lay the burden where it ought to be laid: and the law will execute itself, if that effect can be hoped from any public law. Effectual measures are laid down for levying the tax: and, if once levied, there is no danger of its being allowed to lie unemploy'd in the hands of the collector; for every heritor will be anxious to have some part employ'd for his benefit. The danger will rather be of factious disputes about the distribution. This danger also is attempted to be prevented; and, it is hoped, with success.

Some

Some narrow-minded persons may possibly grudge a tax, that loads the present generation for the advantage of those who come after: but is it rational to grudge, that others should benefit by measures evidently calculated for advancing our own interest? Let us suppose, that the heritors of a shire were to concert measures in common, for improving their lands: to make good roads would be one effectual measure; for supposing the reparation to cost L. 5000, their estates would be bettered double that sum.

To conclude: It is not to be expected that any regulations concerning highways, or concerning any branch of police, can be so framed as to please every individual. Wise men are practicable men, to use an expression of Lord Bacon, and will make concessions in order to promote a general good, if without such concessions it cannot be obtained. Better far to have a good law, tho' in our opinion defective in some articles, than to have no law at all, or, which is worse, a law eminently defective, unjust, and inexpedient.

F I N I S.



